

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

EDITED BY

JAMES HASTINGS, M.A., D.D.

VOLUME THE FIFTEENTH.

OCTOBER 1903 - SEPTEMBER 1904.



EDINBURGH:

T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.

V. 15
1903/04

Printed by
MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED,
FOR

T. & T. CLARK, EDINBURGH.

LONDON	.	.	SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, HAMILTON, KENT, AND CO. LIMITED.
MANCHESTER	.	.	JOHN HEYWOOD.
EDINBURGH	.	.	JOHN MENZIES AND CO.
GLASGOW	.	.	JOHN MENZIES AND CO.
NEW YORK	.	.	CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS.

CONTENTS OF VOL. XV.

AUTHORS.

	PAGE		PAGE
Rev. R. M. ADAMSON, M.A.—		Rev. W. F. COBB, D.D.—	
Bassermann's <i>Reform of the Lord's</i>		Christianity a Prophetic Religion . . .	71
<i>Supper</i>	301	R. L. COLLINS, B.A.—	
Rev. W. AFFLECK, B.D.—		St. Paul's Sojourn in Arabia . . .	382
Baljon's <i>Acts of the Apostles</i> . . .	361	STANLEY A. COOK, M.A.—	
Rev. Professor W. M. ALEXANDER, M.A.,		The Student's <i>Hammurabi</i> . . .	525
B.Sc., B.D., C.M., M.D.—		Late Rev. Professor J. CROSKERY, B.D.—	
St. Paul's Infirmary	469, 545	Christian Work of Women in the Early	
Rev. W. C. ALLEN, M.A.—		Church	111
Christ's Teaching on Divorce . . .	45	Rev. G. J. DANN—	
J. B. ANSTED, M.A.—		'Mice' and 'Emerods'	476
Hebrew and Arabic in Roman Type .	564	Rev. W. H. DAUBNEY, M.A.—	
Professor B. W. BACON, D.D.—		Coverdale on the Apocrypha . . .	383
Was Saul a Hachish-Eater? . . .	380	Rev. W. DEANS, M.A.—	
Professor J. S. BANKS, D.D.—		Tree-Worship in China	384
Early Christianity after Historical Criti-		Rev. Professor R. A. FALCONER, B.D., D.Litt.	
cism	304	A Prophet of the New Israel . . .	259
A Study of the Roman Epistle . . .	411	Rev. G. FARMER, A.K.C.—	
A Short History of the Church . . .	541	The Carob and the Locust	336
Selected Psalms	543	Rev. Professor G. G. FINDLAY, D.D.—	
Rev. W. T. A. BARBER, D.D.—		The Theology of St. John	501
Atonement in Christ	540	Rev H. FIRTH, M.A.—	
Miss G. M. BEVAN—		The Unjust Steward	426
The Bible and Modern Criticism . .	92	Professor KEMPER FULLERTON, M.A.—	
Professor BOEHMER—		Raka	429
A Closing Word on Psalm 149 ⁵ . . .	144	Rev. J. C. GIBSON, D.D.—	
Rev. A. N. BOGLE, M.A.—		The Spiritual Discipline of Science .	105
The Unjust Steward	475	Mrs. M. D. GIBSON, LL.D.—	
Rev. A. BONUS, M.A.—		The Confusion of Tongues	473
<i>Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum</i>		'Let the Woman learn in Silence' .	379
<i>Orientalium</i>	63	Late Rev. W. A. GRAY—	
The Turin Fire	287	Christ's 'Yea'	351
Rev. G. H. BOX, M.A.—		F. LL. GRIFFITH, M.A., F.S.A.—	
St. Peter in the Jewish Liturgy . .	93	Israel in Egypt	498
The Jewish Prayer-Book	313, 362	Professor G. GRÜTZMACHER, Ph.D.—	
Rev. E. P. BOYS-SMITH, M.A.—		The Secret of the Triumph of Christianity	
The Atonement considered as Forgiveness	26	over the Ancient World	8
Rev. Professor BRIGGS, D.D.—		Peter 'the Venerable' of Cluny . . .	536
Problems in the Gospels	14, 67	Rev. T. A. GURNEY, M.A., LL.B.—	
Professor T. K. CHEYNE, D.D., D.Litt.—		Two Oxford Teachers on the Incarnation	402
The Carob and the Locust	335		

CONTENTS.

iv

	PAGE		PAGE
Rev. J. O. HANNAY, M.A.—		Rev. W. MACKINTOSH MACKAY, B.D.—	
Ethical Ideal of Christianity	302	Mr. Tennant's Theory of the Origin of	
The Beginnings of Monasticism	526	Sin	342
Professor A. HARNACK, D.D., Ph.D.—		Rev. A. G. MACKINNON, M.A.—	
Theodor Mommsen	153	An Impressionist Sketch of Sin	380
Rev. Canon Sir JOHN C. HAWKINS, Bart.,		Rev. Professor H. R. MACKINTOSH, D.Phil.—	
M.A.—		War Jesus Ekstatiker?	223
St. Luke's Passion-Narrative and the		The Oldest Gospel	356
Synoptic Problem	122, 273	Rev. W. D. MACLAREN, M.A.—	
Rev. J. HEDLEY—		Can We still Defend a Vicariously Penal	
The Imprecatory Psalms	383	Element in the Atonement?	392
Professor GEORGE HENSLow, M.A., F.L.S.,		Rev. J. E. M'OUAT, M.A.—	
F.G.S.—		2 Samuel 18 ²³	426
The Carob and the Locust	285	Professor EUGÈNE MÉNÉGOZ.—	
Did Jonathan taste Hachish?	336	The Theology of Auguste Sabatier	30
The Carob and the Elephant	429	Rev. H. G. MILLER, M.A.—	
Rev. H. W. HOGG, M.A.—		Rendering of Δέ in the New Testament	551
A New History of Israel	190	Rev. W. D. MILLER, M.A.—	
Rev. H. T. HOOPER, M.A.—		The Unjust Steward	332
The Unjust Steward	426	Rev. JAMES MOFFATT, D.D.—	
Professor F. B. JEVONS, M.A., D.Litt.—		Grill on the Fourth Gospel, and on the	
Tiele's <i>Outlines of the Science of Religion</i>	300	Religion of Mithra	18
Rev. C. H. W. JOHNS, M.A.—		Literary Illustrations of the Sermon on	
Babylonian Monotheism	44	the Mount	508
The Code of Hammurabi	208	Rev. G. MURRAY, B.D.—	
Cuneiform Texts	559	The Unjust Steward	307
E. E. KELLETT, M.A.—		Professor R. G. MURISON, M.A., B.D.—	
Note on Jude 5	381	Character of David	416
Rev. H. A. A. KENNEDY, D.Sc.—		Professor EB. NESTLE, D.D.—	
A Discovery in the History of the New		Abraham, the Friend of God	46
Testament Text	395	A Little Mistake in the Revised Version	95
G. A. KING—		Quotation Marks in the New Testament	237
Raka	287	Modern Greek Testament of the Bible	
Professor ED. KÖNIG, D.D.—		Society	286
The General Synod of the Evangelical		Coverdale on the Apocrypha	335
Church of Prussia in the Year 1903	200	Scotch Editions of the Septuagint	427
Unscientific Points of View in the Babel-		Resen	476
Bible Controversy	479	Quotation Types	479
Rev. F. W. LEWIS, B.A.—		The Woe on Chorazin, Bethsaida, and	
John 16 ²³	381	Capernaum	524
Principal T. M. LINDSAY, D.D.—		'Anise' and 'Rue'	528
Original Documents on the Reformation	186	Tamar	141
Plenary Indulgences and the Reformation	225	Contributions to the Greek Testament	370
The Cult of Attis	306	First English Example of 'Biblia'	565
Rev. J. A. STOKES LITTLE, M.A.—		Rev. W. O. E. OESTERLEY, M.A.—	
Was Saul a Hachish-Eater?	239	A Great Heap of Stones	47
Rev. E. G. LOOSLEY, M.A.—		Rev. DE LACY O'LEARY—	
'His Own'	381	Rabbinic Illustrations of the Epistle of	
R. A. STEWART MACALISTER, M.A., F.S.A.—		St. James	334
The Scene of the Sacrifice of Isaac	141	The Descent into Hell	144
Professor S. M'COMB, D.D.—		Professor J. ORR, D.D.—	
Professor von Dobschütz on the Resur-		A Thoroughgoing Realist	409
rection History	224	Professor J. A. PATERSON, D.D.—	
Rev. D. B. MACDONALD, Ph.D.—		The Writings of Prof. A. B. Davidson	566
Predestination in Islam	62		

	PAGE		PAGE
Rev. J. PORTEOUS, B.D.—		Rev. G. AIRD SIM—	
The Greater Sin	428	The Catacombs of Città Vecchia in the	
Miss H. L. POWELL—		Island of Malta	168
Scripture-Teaching in Girls' Schools	116	Rev. A. H. MONCUR SIME, M.A.—	
Rev. M. A. POWER, S.J.—		Living in Christ	228
The Date of Polycarp's Martyrdom in		Rev. J. D. SINCLAIR, B.D.—	
the Jewish Calendar	330	Restoration of Aix Cathedral	303
Bishop Lightfoot and Professor Ramsay		Rev. DAVID SMITH, M.A.—	
on Early Calendars	515	The Songs of the Ascents	39
Rev. A. POYNTER, M.A.—		Raka	235
Mark 4 ¹²	141	W. TAYLOR SMITH, M.A.—	
Rev. F. B. PROCTOR, M.A.—		Jesus Christ and Paul	16
The Retrospective Love of God	247	Rev. J. E. SOMERVILLE, B.D.—	
Professor W. M. RAMSAY, LL.D., D.C.L.—		The Invitation to the Thirsty	77
The Date of Polycarp's Martyrdom	221	Rev. JAMES STRACHAN, M.A.—	
Notes on the New Testament and the		The Writings of the late Professor A. B.	
Early Church	397	Davidson	450
Rev. W. M. RANKIN, B.D.—		Rev. Professor SWETE, D.D., Litt.D.—	
Love's Offering	495	Christ the Wisdom of God	58
Rev. JOHN REID, M.A.—		The New Oxyrhynchus Sayings	488
'Lord' and 'The Lord' in the Book of		Rev. FR. SYDNEY, S.S.C.—	
Acts	296	Raka	478
'Born of Water and Spirit'	413	Rev. Professor J. G. TASKER—	
Rev. G. M. REITH, M.A.—		The New Herzog	20
Cross-Bearing	238	The Talmud and Theology	187
Rev. J. E. ROBERTS, M.A., B.D.—		Cyprian's Letters	410
The Anointing of David	474	Sources of the Clementines	499
Professor G. S. ROWE—		Rev. C. TAYLOR, D.D.—	
The Transfiguration	336	The Homily of Pseudo-Clement	524
Right Rev. H. E. RYLE, D.D.—		Rev. JOHN TAYLOR, Litt.D.—	
The Old Testament in Teaching and		Baumann's <i>Aufbau des Amosreden</i>	64
Preaching	177	Holzinger's <i>Numbers</i>	115
Rev. Professor A. H. SAYCE, D.D.—		Martí's <i>Minor Prophets</i>	358
Canaanite Conception of God	232	Rev. H. H. THEOBALD—	
Hebrews and Babylonian Influence	75	Union of the Race with Christ	383
Laws of Hammurabi	184, 369	Rev. W. H. GRIFFITH THOMAS, B.D.—	
New Exploration Society	369	'Let the Woman learn in Silence'	428
Recent Biblical and Oriental Archæ-		Rev. D. MACRAE TOD, B.D.—	
ology 75, 184, 231, 280, 369, 405, 514, 555		The Poetry and Wit of Jeremiah	461
Hittites of Southern Palestine	280, 474	Rev. Professor A. TOMORY, M.A.—	
Discoveries in Palestine	555	<i>Things as They are</i>	252
Rev. E. F. SCOTT, B.A.—		Rev. DAWSON WALKER, M.A., B.D.—	
Haussleiter and Wrede on the Fourth		The Destination of the Epistle to the	
Gospel	189	Hebrews	142
Rev. J. A. SELBIE, D.D.—		Ven. C. WATSON, B.D.—	
<i>International Critical Commentary on</i>		A Short Study of St. John 3 ²⁻⁵	239
<i>Numbers</i>	42	Rev. W. WEBSTER, M.A.—	
The Original Book of Deuteronomy	172	The Phrase 'The Virgin-Birth of our	
Professor A. B. Davidson's <i>Old Testa-</i>		Lord'	331
ment Prophecy	205	Precedent Cases and 'Fazanias' in Bible	
Tamar	238	History	424
Recent Foreign Theology: A Survey 254, 444		Rev. Prebendary B. WHITEFOORD, D.D.—	
Professor A. B. Davidson's <i>Theology of</i>		The Need of Prophets	448
the <i>Old Testament</i>	439		
Jerahmeel	478		

SUBJECTS.

	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
Abijam and Abijah	560	Cypriote-Greek influence in Pales-		Jebusites	283
Absolute, The	483	tine	557	Jerahmeel	478
Abraham, the Friend of God . .	46	David, Anointing	474	Jeremiah, Poetry and Wit of . .	461
Adar	559	Character	416	Jewish Prayer-Book	313, 362
Amos	360	Davidson, late Professor A. B., . .		Joel	359, 360
Anise	528	Outlook on Life	99	John the Baptist	5
Arabic in Roman Type	564	<i>Old Test. Prophecy</i>	205	John, Theology of	501
Archæology, Recent Biblical and		<i>Theology of the Old</i>		Judaism	145
Oriental	75, 184, 231, 280,	<i>Testament</i>	439	Julian the Apostate	9
.	369, 405, 514, 555	Writings of	450, 566	Justification	197
Ari	515	Deaconess	114	Khabiri	282
Ascents, Songs of the	39	Deuteronomy, Original Book of . .	172	Khammurabi, Laws of	184
Atonement	147, 195	Divorce, Christ's Teaching on . .	45	Kas	282
" considered as For-		'Ecstasy' in Christ	223	Life, Eternal	150
giveness	26	Eden, Babylonian Parallel to . .	50	Literary Illustrations of the	
" in Christ	540	Emerods	476	Sermon on the Mount	508
" vicariously Penal Ele-		Eridu	51	Living in Christ'	228
ment in	392	Eschatology of Psalms	390	Locust and Carob	285, 335
Attis, Cult of	306	Exposition, Notes of Recent . .	1, 49,	'Lord' and 'The Lord' in Acts . .	289,
Babel-Bibel Controversy	479, 500	97, 145, 193, 241, 289,		296	
Babylon and Israel	290	337, 385, 433, 481, 529		Lord's Supper	151, 301, 386
Babylonian Monotheism	44	Foreign Theology, Recent	16, 62,	Love, God's Retrospective	247
Balaam	405	111, 186, 223, 254, 300,		Love's Offering	495
Baptism, Institution of	294	356, 409, 444, 498, 541		Malta Fever	547
Behemoth	429	Forgiveness and Atonement	26	Man, Antiquity of	241
Bible and Modern Criticism . . .	92	France, Religious Situation in . .	242	Marriage	111
'Biblia,' First English Example .	565	Future State	391, 443	Merodach	514
'Born of Water and Spirit' . .	413	Genesis, Divine Names	433	Messianic Hope	20, 206
Calendars, Early	515	Gezer, Discoveries at	97	Mice and Emerods	476
Capernaum, Site of	100	Gihon	514	Ministry, Lack of Candidates . .	102
Carob and Locust	285, 335	God as Father	507	Modern Greek Testament of the	
Catacombs of Città Vecchia . . .	168	" as Light	505	Bible Society	286
Celtic Literature, Critical Study .	531	" as Love	506	Mommsen, Theodor	153
Chorazin, Bethsaida, and Caper-		" as Spirit	504	Monasticism, Beginnings of . . .	526
naum, Woe on	524	" in the Old Testament	440	Monism	244
Christ, Betrayal	386	" Knowledge of	501	Monotheism, Babylonian	44
" Ecstasy	223	Gospels, Synoptic	435	Names, Divine, in the Pentateuch	433
" Historical Character	292	" Contradictions	533	Natural and Supernatural	485
" Injunctions of Silence	388	Greek Testament, Contributions		Need of Prophets	448
" Resurrection	227, 292, 387	to the	370	New Testament and the Early	
" Sinlessness	484	Hachish	148, 239, 336, 380	Church	397
" the Wisdom of God	58	Hammurabi, Code of	525	" Text, Discovery	
" Union with Human Race . . .	383	Hebrew in Roman type		in	305
" Virgin-Birth	331	Hebrews, Destination of the . .		Ninib	559
" and the Church	340	Epistle to the	142	Noah	514
Christ's 'Yea'	351	Hell, Descent into	144	Note-Line in Hebrew Scrip-	
Christianity a Prophetic Religion .	71	Heredity	104	tures	49, 500
" after Historical Criti-		Hittites in Southern Palestine . .	280,	<i>Numbers, International Critical</i>	
cism	304	474, 558	<i>Commentary</i>	42
" Ethical Ideal of	302	Holiness in the Old Testament . .	441	Old Testament in Teaching and	
" Triumph over Ancient		Homily of Pseudo-Clement . . .	524	Preaching	177
World	8	Hosea	358, 359	<i>Old Testament Prophecy</i>	205
Chronology, Biblical	241	Hour, Fifth to Tenth	397	" Theology	439
Clementines, Sources of the . . .	499	Imprecatory Psalms	52	Oxyrhynchus Sayings, The New . .	488
Commentary, Great Text	233, 277,	Index of Religious, Ethical, and		Palestine, Discoveries	555
310, 366, 399, 462, 511, 548		Theological Articles	324	<i>Palestine Exploration Fund</i> . . .	97
Comparative Religion	194	" of Theological Literature . .	216,	Paul and Christ	16
Confusion of Tongues	473	465	" Infirmary	469, 545
Contract Tablets	76	Incarnation, Necessity	541	" Sojourn in Arabia	382
Contributions and Comments . . .	44, 92,	" Two Oxford Teachers		Peter in Jewish Liturgy	93
141, 235, 285, 331,		on	402	Peter 'the Venerable' of Cluny . .	536
379, 424, 473, 524, 564		Invitation to the Thirsty	77	Plenary Indulgences and the	
Conversion	337	Isaac, Scene of the Sacrifice of . .	141	Reformation	225
Coverdale on the Apocrypha . . .	335, 383	Israel in Egypt	498	Point and Illustration	69, 175,
Creds, Obligation of	54	" New History of	190	220, 271, 406
Criticism and Evolution	532	" and Babylon	75, 290	Polycarp's Martyrdom, Date of . .	221,
Cross-Bearing	238	Jahwe in Babylonian	560	330, 398
Cuneiform, Extent of use	557	James, Epistle, Rabbinical Illus-		Precedent Cases and 'Fazania's' in	
" Texts	559	trations	334	Bible History	424

	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
Priscilla	112	Sabbath-Breaking	530	Steward, Unjust	307, 332, 475, 481
Problems in the Gospels	14, 67	Sacrifice	442	Stones, A Great Heap of	47
<i>Prophecy, Old Testament</i>	205	„ Infant	98	Supernatural	485
Prophet of the New Israel	259	Satan	442	Taanach, Discoveries at	555
Prophets, Need of	448	Saul, Malady of	148, 239, 336, 380	Talmud and Theology	187
Prussia, General Synod of the		Science, Spiritual Discipline of	105	Tamar	141, 238
„ Evangelical Church	200	Scripture - Teaching in Girls' Schools	116	Teaching, Religious	4
Psalms, Eschatology of	390	Secret of the Triumph of Christianity over the Ancient World	8	Textual Criticism	293
„ Imprecatory	52, 383	Semitic Religion	231, 390	Theological Literature, Index to	216, 324, 465
„ Titles	330	Septuagint, Scotch Editions of	427	Theology of Auguste Sabatier	30
Purity	481	Sermon on the Mount, Literary Illustrations	508	„ of the Old Testament	439
Quotation Marks in the New Testament	237	Serpent	52	<i>Things as They are</i>	252
„ Types	479	Servant of the Lord	206	Transfiguration	I, 197, 245, 336
Rabbinical Illustrations of the Epistle of St. James	334	Seventy, The	14	Tree-Worship	384
Raka	235, 287, 429, 478	Sin	3	Trinity in Physical Science	438
Redemption by Blood	529	„ in the Old Testament	380, 441	Turin Fire	288
Rehob	556	„ Mr. Tennant's Theory of the Origin of	342	Twelve, The	14
Religions of Greece and Rome, Literature on	346	Songs of the Ascents	39	Two Oxford Teachers on the Incarnation	402
Resen	476	Spirit of God	441	Unjust Steward	307, 332, 426, 475, 481
Resurrection of Christ	224, 387	St. Luke's Passion-Narrative and Synoptic Problem	122, 273	Virgin-Birth of our Lord	331
Retrospective Love of God	247	St. Paul's Infirmary	469	Widows in the Church	114
Romans, Epistle to the	411			Women in the Early Church	111
Rue	528			Zionist Movement	531
Sabatier, Auguste	30				

BOOKS.

	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
Abbott, Paradosis	385	Garnier, Worship of the Dead	265	Macdonald, Tree in the Midst	375
Adamson, Modern Philosophy	456	Gosse, Jeremy Taylor	265	Macdonell, Life of Benvenuto Cellini	37
Bassermann, Reform of the Lord's Supper	301	Graves, Sir George Grove	211	Marvin, Introduction to Systematic Philosophy	38
Baumann, Aufbau der Amosreden	64	Green, Handbook of Church History	126	Means, St. Paul and the Ante-Nicene Church	129
Bethune-Baker, Early History of Christian Doctrine	80	Grill, Persische Mysterienreligion	19	Montefiore, Liberal Judaism	145
Brockington, Parables of the Way	481	„ Fourth Gospel	18	Moore, New Testament in the Christian Church	421
Butler, Robert Leighton	157	Gunkel, Israel and Babylon	290	„ Principia Ethica	128
Caird, Evolution of Theology in the Greek Philosophers	321	„ Selected Psalms	543	Parker, China Past and Present	374
Caldecott and Mackintosh, Literature of Theism	418	Haldane, Pathway to Reality	419	Parry, Epistle of St. James	266
Cambridge Modern History	38, 264	Hall, Christian Doctrine of Prayer	421	Paues, Fourteenth Century English Biblical Version	457
Carroll, Exiles of Eternity	212	Harnack, Chronologie	444	Peake, Problem of Suffering in the Old Testament	519
Clay's Cuneiform Texts	65	Hastie, Theology of the Reformed Church	519	Pooler, Psalms of Israel	399
Cook, Code of Hammurabi	208	Henson, Value of the Bible	484	Réville, Liberal Christianity	146
Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium	63	Hepding, Attis	306	Ross, Teaching of Jesus	420
Creighton, Mind of St. Peter	421	Herford, Christianity in Talmud and Midrash	321	Sabatier, Religions of Authority and Religion of the Spirit	456
Cumont, Mysteries of Mithra	86	Herzog, vol. xii.	20	Sanday, Sacred Sites of the Gospels	100
Davidson, Called of God	99, 198	Hodge, Intuitive Perception	409	Schmidtké, Evangelien eines alten Unzialcodex	305
„ Old Test. Prophecy	148	Holtzmann, Life of Jesus	323	Schubert, Grundzüge der Kirchengeschichte	29
„ Old Test. Theology	439	„ War Jesus Ekstasiker?	223	Smith, Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia	158
Denney, Atonement and Modern Mind	147	Holzinger, Numbers	115	„ Old Testament History	52
Devine, Mystical Theology	81	Hudson, Rousseau	127	von Soden, Cyprian's Letters	410
Dictionary of Christian Archaeology	227	Inge, Faith and Knowledge	437, 484	Somervell, Eternal Life	150
Dobschütz, Easter and Pentecost	224	Jeremias, Alte Testament im Lichte des alten Orients	445	Souttar, Short History of Ancient Peoples	126
„ Probleme des apostolischen Zeitalters	304	Jewish Encyclopedia	158, 374	Spiegelberg, Israel in Egypt	498
Driver, Book of Genesis	241	Jones, Dawn of European Civilization	36	Stanton, Gospels as Historical Documents	156
Drummond, Character and Authorship of Fourth Gospel	322	Jülicher, Introduction to the New Testament	322	Tennant, Fall and Original Sin	79
Expositor's Greek Testament	209	Kennedy, Note-Line in the Hebrew Scriptures	49		
Farrar, Life of F. W. Farrar	373	„ St. Paul's Conception of the Last Things	455		
Feine, Der Romerbrief	411	Lévy-Bruhl, Philosophy of Auguste Comte	80		
„ Jesus Christus und Paulus	16				
Fiebig, Talmud und Theologie	187				

	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
Thirtle, Titles of the Psalms . . .	339	Vlieger, Predestination in Islam . . .	62	Wright, Protestant Dictionary . . .	374
Thompson, Devils and Evil . . .		Waggett, Religion and Science . . .	377	" Synopsis of the Gospels . . .	210
Spirits of Babylonia . . .	50	Waitz, Sources of the Clementines . . .	499	in Greek . . .	
Tiele, Outlines of Science of . . .		Wallace, Man's Place in the . . .		Zöckler, Ethical Ideal of Chris- . . .	302
Religion . . .	300	Universe . . .	157	tianity . . .	
Tymms, Christian Idea of Atone- . . .	518	Walsh, Jesuits in Great Britain . . .	37	Zscharnack, Christian Work of . . .	
ment . . .		Weiss, Das älteste Evangelium . . .	356	Women in the Early Church . . .	111

HEBREW WORDS.

	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
אֶרֶץ הַכְּנָעַנִים . . .	141	טַחְרִים . . .	476	נֶפֶשׁ . . .	75	פִּשֶׁע . . .	380, 441
דְּבַשׁ . . .	149, 239, 336	יָהּ . . .	144	עֹן . . .	381	צְפוּנִי . . .	360
דֶּרֶךְ הַכְּפָר . . .	426	יַעֲרָה . . .	149, 239, 336	עִיר . . .	77	קֶדֶשׁ . . .	442
חָג . . .	76	מִלֵּא אֶת־יָד . . .	382	עַכְבָּר . . .	477	רְמִיָּה . . .	381
חֶרֶב and חֲנָב . . .	286	מִצּוֹה . . .	173	עַפְלוֹם . . .	476	תּוֹרָה . . .	173
חֲטָאָה . . .	380, 441						

GREEK WORDS.

	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
αἰτω . . .	381	ἐντός . . .	387	κύριος . . .	289, 296, 370, 381	ραββί . . .	370
ἄκρις . . .	285, 335, 336, 429	ἐξέστη . . .	223	λαλέω . . .	113	ρακά . . .	235, 287, 429, 478
ἀλήθεια . . .	18	θάμβος . . .	491	μεταμορφώω . . .	1	σκόλοψ . . .	409
ἀνηθον . . .	528	θεωρέω and ὁράω . . .	53	παντοκράτωρ . . .	491	σοφία . . .	18
ἀνθεν . . .	239	ἰδία . . .	381	παράδοσις . . .	385	τετέλεσται . . .	139
γυνή . . .	379	Ἰησοῦς . . .	381	παρατηρέω . . .	493	ὑπακούω . . .	380, 428
δέ . . .	551	κεράτιον . . .	285, 335, 336, 429	πήγανον . . .	528	ὑποτάσσομαι . . .	380, 428
ἐλκω . . .	491	κολληρίδες . . .	360	προφητεύω . . .	113	φίλος θεοῦ . . .	47

TEXTS.

	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
Gn x. . .	28	Amos vi. 5, 10. . .	361	Jn xii. 2 . . .	495	Ac xv. 17 . . .	297
xiii. . .	284	viii. 14 . . .	361	xvi. 23 . . .	381	xv. 26 . . .	300
Nu xxix. . .	448	Mt iv. 12 . . .	553	xix. 11 . . .	428	xvi. 30, 31 . . .	548
Jg i. 8 . . .	284	v. 3 . . .	508	xix. 30 . . .	139	xviii. 25 . . .	299
1 S xiv. . .	149, 336	v. 9, 10, 11, 16, 20, . . .		Ac i. 24 . . .	297	xx. 28 . . .	299
2 S xiv. 14 . . .	534	28, 38 f. . .	509	ii. 20, 21 . . .	298	xx. 32 . . .	300
xviii. 23 . . .	426	v. 43 f., 45, 46 . . .	510	iv. 33 . . .	300	xxviii. 12 . . .	300
2 K ix. 27 . . .	557	vi. 5, 6, 21, 33 . . .	510	vii. 59-60 . . .	233	Ro iii. 21, 22 . . .	555
xix. 37 . . .	559	vii. 1-5 . . .	510	viii. 22, 24, 25 . . .	299	vi. 4 . . .	228
1 Ch iv. 22, 23 . . .	558	vii. 14, 17, 21, 29 . . .	511	ix. 3-6 . . .	277	1 Co i. 23, 24 . . .	58
Job xxvi. 14. . .	105	x. 18 . . .	554	ix. 17 . . .	300	iii. 23 . . .	553
Ps xxxii. 1, 2 . . .	380	xi. 1 . . .	67	x. 33 . . .	297	ix. 1 . . .	53
lxxxviii. 5 . . .	390	xi. 2, 7, 11, 12 . . .	552	x. 34, 35 . . .	310	xiv. 34-36 . . .	113
cxxxiii. . .	39	xii. 3-9 . . .	45	x. 36 . . .	298	2 Co i. 8, 9 . . .	546
cxxxix. 7, 8 . . .	390	xx. 4 . . .	551	x. 38 . . .	366	i. 19 . . .	351
cxlix. 5 . . .	144	xxviii. 17 . . .	552	xi. 17 . . .	300	ii. 2, 5, 7, 8 . . .	545
Ec xii. 5 . . .	286	xxviii. 19 . . .	294	xi. 26 . . .	399	Eph iii. 20 . . .	553
Is lxiii. 1. . .	485	Mk iv. 1, 2 . . .	141	xii. 1, 2, 3, 5, 6 . . .	553	v. 33 . . .	428
Jer xi. 19 . . .	380	vi. 25 . . .	95	xii. 8, 10, 13, 14-16, . . .		Col. ii. 2, 3 . . .	58
Ezk xiii. 18-21. . .	75	x. 2-12 . . .	45	18, 19 . . .	554	1 Ti ii. 11 . . .	379
xxxvi. 17-38 . . .	437	x. 32 . . .	552	xii. 11, 17. . .	299	Heb i. 6 . . .	553
Hos ii. 15 . . .	359	Lk iii. 21 . . .	552	xii. 23, 24 . . .	554	Ja i. 17 . . .	334
iii. 1 . . .	359	ix. 57-61 . . .	370	xiii. 2 . . .	299	ii. 3 . . .	334
v. 1-11 . . .	360	Jn iii. 2-5 . . .	239	xiii. 2, 3 . . .	462	v. 17 . . .	334, 335
Amos iv. 3 . . .	360	iii. 5 . . .	295, 413	xiii. 13, 14 . . .	545	1 P . . .	259
v. 26 . . .	360	vii. 37, 38 . . .	77	xiv. 17 . . .	511	Jude 5 . . .	381

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THERE is no outstanding event in the life of our Lord so disappointing as the Transfiguration. It seems so great: we get so little out of it. It is not that we do not fathom it. We may not fathom the Temptation. But we get a great deal of meaning out of the Temptation, and we think we understand the purpose of it. Out of the Transfiguration we get very little either for science or edification. Even as to its purpose there is no assurance though there are many theories.

Two theories regarding the purpose of the Transfiguration have recently been published. Dr. H. A. A. Kennedy is the author of the first. He published it in the *Journal of Theological Studies* for January. Dr. Kennedy's theory is that the Transfiguration was chiefly for the sake of the disciples. It was intended to prepare them for the Resurrection. If the Resurrection was the great event that lay before them, in the Resurrection itself the fact of greatest moment would be the identity of the risen Christ. The disciples were to be witnesses of the Resurrection. But how could they be witnesses if they did not know Him when He rose? He would rise in a glorified body. It would be very different from the body of His humiliation. What if they did not recognize Him at all? We are told that when He appeared to the five hundred upon the mountain in Galilee, 'some doubted.' What if they were all to doubt,

and when the day of witness came, they could only say that they thought He might have risen from the dead?

So the Transfiguration was given. Three of the disciples were taken up with Him into the Mount, and saw His glory. They saw Him in the glorified form in which He would afterwards appear to them when He rose from the dead. The Transfiguration took place in order that Peter and James and John might recognize their Lord when He appeared to them after His Resurrection, and so be able to bear witness that He had risen indeed.

Dr. Kennedy finds three arguments to support his theory. The first argument is the word used to describe the Transfiguration. It is the word we translate, 'He was transfigured before them' (μετεμορφώθη). That word, says Dr. Kennedy, 'reminds us vividly of the hints afforded by the Gospel records regarding His post-resurrection appearances.' He says, further, that it recalls most strikingly the verb which St. Paul uses when describing the change which the power of Christ will effect in the bodies of believers. The reference is to Phil 3²¹. Our translation is, 'Who shall fashion anew the body of our humiliation, that it may be conformed to the body of His glory' (σύμμορφον τῷ σῶματι τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ).

The second argument is in the word 'glory' itself. This is the word used to describe the general effect of Christ's appearance when He was transfigured. St. Luke (9³¹) says, 'They saw His glory.' Of Moses and Elijah also is it said, that they 'appeared in glory.' Now, says Dr. Kennedy, 'we know that *glory* was the term used in the apostolic age to denote the appearance of the risen life, whether of Christ Himself or of His followers.'

The third argument lies in the silence which was imposed upon the disciples. They were commanded to tell no one what they had seen 'until the Son of man be raised from the dead' (Mt 17⁹). To this St. Mark adds, and Dr. Kennedy finds much significance in the addition, that 'they kept the saying (that is, the command), questioning among themselves what the rising from the dead should mean.'

The author of the other theory is the Rev. R. Holmes, M.A. Mr. Holmes writes in the *Journal of Theological Studies* for July. He does not believe in Dr. Kennedy's theory. He thinks Dr. Kennedy's arguments are too slender to be convincing. And he holds that the facts are inconsistent with it.

Dr. Kennedy's theory, we are reminded, is that the Transfiguration was granted to Peter, James, and John, in order that they might know the Lord when He rose again from the dead. But, says Mr. Holmes, when the Lord rose again from the dead, He did not appear to Peter, James, and John. His first appearance was to Mary Magdalene; His second was most probably to the company of women returning from the sepulchre; and His third to the two on the way to Emmaus. None of these persons were present at the Transfiguration, yet they recognized the Lord. It is only at the fourth appearance that a witness of the Transfiguration comes upon the scene. And even then, says Mr. Holmes, no stress is laid on the appearance to St. Peter; it is recorded merely in a

report of some words of the apostles given by St. Luke, and it is mentioned again by St. Paul.

It is true that those to whom Jesus appeared after His Resurrection did not always recognize Him at first. But there is no evidence that they were assisted by any recollection of the Transfiguration. Such a recollection indeed seems to be quite unnecessary, since Jesus apparently had the power of making Himself known at will. The only occasion which seems to Mr. Holmes to favour Dr. Kennedy's theory is the appearance on the shore of the lake (Jn 21^{1st}). On that occasion Peter and James and John were all present. Jesus stood on the shore, but the disciples knew not that it was Jesus. John was the first to recognize Him. But how? Not by any recollection of the Transfiguration, but rather, says Mr. Holmes, quoting the words of Westcott, 'by a certain sympathy with Him.'

So Mr. Holmes sets aside Dr. Kennedy's theory, and then advances his own. His own theory is that the Transfiguration was intended to prepare the disciples for the Cross and to assure them of the Crown. These are two different things. It was the setting of the Transfiguration that taught the first; the Transfiguration itself taught the second. Mr. Holmes points out what the setting of the Transfiguration is. It was preceded by the prophecy of His sufferings; it was followed by the incident of the demoniac, and a repetition of the suffering prophecy. Thus by the setting of the Transfiguration, the disciples were taught to surrender their expectations of worldly success, and to enter the kingdom by way of the Cross. But the Transfiguration itself was given to assure them of the Crown. If they had to enter the kingdom by way of the Cross, it was at least a real kingdom that they entered.

The things that affect the Society of Friends are of interest to us all. One thing is affecting Quakerism just now at its very heart. It is the

problem of a paid and professional ministry. The *British Friend* (a well-managed and most enjoyable magazine) has much to say about it from month to month. In the number for August the question is definitely raised whether there is any authority for a paid ministry in the New Testament.

The writer, Mr. John W. Graham, concludes that there is not. He knows that in the New Testament occur the words, 'The labourer is worthy of his hire.' But the hire, he says, is hospitality and nothing more, and sends those who doubt his interpretation to examine the context. He knows that the words, 'Even so did the Lord ordain that they which preach the gospel should live of the gospel,' are also found in the New Testament. But now he says—and his interpretation is now startling enough—that these words are not based on the canonical Gospels, that they represent a tradition of less weight; and that in any case they do not refer to ministers at home but to missionaries abroad.

Professor Samuel M. Smith, who is one of the editors of the *Bible Student*, has been writing in that magazine on Sin. What he means by Sin is any want of conformity unto, or transgression of, the Law of God; and he does not think it necessary to mark his words as a quotation.

Professor Smith thinks that there is too much sin in our day and too little sense of it. He does not mean that we break the commandments more than our fathers did. He thinks we break them less. He thinks there never was a time when more was done to avoid sin and to prevent it in others. Still he holds that sin is far more prevalent than it used to be, and that for some years the sense of it has been steadily growing less.

For men are forgetting that there are two Tables of the Law. To the Second Table there never was more attention paid. But the Second Table has to do with our duty to our fellow-men. The First Table, which has to do with our duty to God,

is greater. The transgression of the First Table is the only proper meaning of sin. And Professor Smith believes that we are losing sight of the very existence of the First Table of the Law.

The First Table contains four commandments. Professor Smith holds that every one of them is ignored or even denied in our day. For the first charge he brings against our age is its worldliness, its absorption in material as opposed to spiritual things, in short, its rejection of the first commandment, 'Thou shalt have no other gods before me.' Curiously enough he almost omits the second commandment. Perhaps its transgression is less flagrant in America than here. But on the third and fourth he is emphatic. The third commandment is, 'Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain.' Profanity, says Professor Smith, is painfully prevalent; its prevalence is symptomatic of a broader irreverence which has been growing before our eyes, till scarcely anything is now counted sacred—God's Name, God's Word, God's Church. The fourth commandment is, 'Remember the Sabbath Day to keep it holy.' Dr. Smith thinks it is too long since many of us kept it holy for us to remember anything about it.

We have lost the sense of sin, says Professor Smith, and we are like to lose the word. It does not enter into literature now. It is rarely used in the pulpit. For inasmuch as it is the Second Table of the Law we give our attention to, we feel that when we wish to express the transgression of the Law, a better word than sin is vice or crime. Moreover, it is an ethical, untheological age. Vice and crime are ethical, untheological words. And finally, we may as well confess that we do not like to obtrude the thought of God so nakedly as sin does—the thought of a God with whom we have to do. We may have to do with Him and may have to think of that, but at present we have enough to do with our neighbour.

In the pulpit, it has been said, manner is more

than matter. For the matter of preaching is the Bible, and if the preacher cannot make the Bible more impressive by his manner of presenting it than the hearer finds the reading of it, the reason for preaching disappears. It is the same with the teaching of the Bible to the young. We are much exercised at present about the kind of religious instruction our young people receive. The more important consideration is not what they are taught, but how they are taught it.

Dr. David Beaton of Lincoln Park Congregational Church, Chicago, contributes an article to the July number of the *Biblical World* on the manner of teaching the Bible. He says that the teacher of the Bible is exposed to two kinds of danger. The one kind he describes as the danger of naturalism, the other of supernaturalism. It is the life-story of some saint, some patriot, or some hero of the Bible that happens to form the lesson. How is the teacher to teach it? He has to teach it in such a way that the hand of God will be seen working in and through the man; otherwise it is not religious teaching. Yet at the same time the man must be a man, human, interesting. If the teacher shows his hero to be a hero only, he has fallen into the danger of naturalism. If he shows God's hand working independently of the hero, he has fallen into the danger of supernaturalism. That is what Dr. Beaton means. 'Naturalism,' he says, 'lays emphasis on the natural ability, the genius, the courage of the man described in the Bible; supernaturalism lays emphasis on the power of God, the working of the Holy Spirit: in each case a distorted image of the fact is presented to the pupil.'

Why should the teacher not dwell exclusively if he chooses upon the courage, the self-sacrifice, of the man or woman he is describing? Are those not excellent qualities to inculcate? They are. But this teacher is a religious teacher. That is to say, he has not only to encourage the pupil to be courageous and self-sacrificing, he

has to lay these virtues with binding power upon his heart and conscience. Why should I endure the trials that make a hero, asks the pupil, or the discipline that makes a saint, because this man was a hero or that woman a saint? And the teacher of naturalism has no answer to give. For saints and heroes have no authority in themselves to constrain the conscience, whether they are in the Bible or out of it.

But the other danger is greater. It is not so common as once it was, and its danger is steadily diminishing; but in the teaching of the young it is the greater danger still. Why should the teacher not dwell exclusively on the supernatural, that is to say, upon the hand of God in the Bible? Because he robs the Bible of its human interest and reality, and he is no longer entitled to the name of teacher. The heroes of the Bible must touch the heroic in ourselves, its saints must kindle the flame of saintliness; they do not come near enough to touch us if they live in a world in which the laws of nature do not operate. James Gilmour, reading the Psalms of David in a filthy Mongol tent, without a sympathetic hand to cool the fever of fatigue and disappointment upon his brow, cries out, 'How *one* the soul of man is!' for the Psalmist's heart and his have met, the Psalmist's struggles and disappointments are real and human as his own.

So, if we are to teach the Bible aright, we must be neither natural nor supernatural, but we must be both. And now the teacher himself, untrained and ill-encouraged, turns round and says, 'But what must I do if I cannot be both?' To which Dr. Beaton answers, 'Then it is better to be natural than supernatural.' For, if the teacher is supernatural only, it may be easy for him to say, 'God did it,' or 'The Holy Spirit taught him,' or 'God was with him and he could not fail'; it may seem to honour God and the Bible, says Dr. Beaton, thus to 'laugh at impossibilities and go smashing through the facts of life'; but it is a sign of intellectual shallowness and moral weak-

ness; it is an evidence of unbelief in the divine unity of the universe; and it comes home in retribution by making the victim of such teaching either a fanatic or a sceptic.

If we cannot be both natural and supernatural then, says Dr. Beaton, let us at least be natural. For he thinks that not only does it do the less harm, but that it is nearer the mind of God. For 'God has given His revelation, not by the lives of angels but of men, and in the most normal relations of humanity, the family and the state, in the experiences of love, of fatherhood and motherhood, of king and subject, of peasant and prince, of poet and mechanic, of hero and saint. And above all, to crown and consummate this revelation, the Son of God was made flesh, so that He might continue the record of revelation to us as a man, that the holiest and noblest of all lives might also be the most natural and most closely connected with our own.'

But why should not the teacher be trained and encouraged to be both natural and supernatural in his teaching? Why should he not learn and be able to teach that the lives in the Bible are genuine lives, that the men and women had to solve their own problems and work out their own salvation by the ordinary gifts and graces of a virtuous nature and a loving heart, that the hero was victorious through the exercise of a strong will and a self-sacrificing disposition; and yet that the daily task was undertaken and life's victories won in the presence of a Divine Spirit who lived in them and ruled over them? Then will the pupil feel that his own sufferings, his own temptations, and his own work are filled with the same divine life and ruled by the same authority as the saints and heroes of the Bible story. 'As these men and women loved and served their country, and built up a civilization so different from the civilization of any other part of the world, he will strive to make the life of *his* nation holy, *its* history too shall be a Bible, and the footsteps of God shall be traced in the deeds of *its* heroes

and the thoughts of *its* saints. He becomes the conscious and willing instrument of God, learning the final lesson of all revelation—the purpose of God in the life of the individual and the race.'

'There was a man sent from God, whose name was John' (Jn 1⁶). The words have the ring of the Bible, the ring of authority, the royal ring in them. They are both natural and supernatural. He was a man, his name was John, that is natural; but he was sent from God, that is supernatural. The supernatural predominates, as it does all through the chapter. But it never runs away with the natural. Jesus saw Nathanael under the fig tree before Philip called him, but Philip had to call him. John was sent from God, but that does less to remove him away from us than do the leathern girdle and the wild honey, and yet these are human enough.

For we are all sent from God. No doubt John was sent for a special purpose. So also was Jesus: 'I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel.' So also were the disciples: 'As the Father hath sent Me into the world, even so send I you into the world.' But so also are we. So also is every man. There was a man sent from God whose name was —: let every man insert his own name and the words are true.

John was sent to be a Forerunner. That was *his* special purpose in life. We too are sent for some special purpose. And the greatest difference between John and us may lie, not in that he was sent for a special purpose, nor in that his special purpose in life was to be the Forerunner of the Christ, but in that he recognized what his purpose in life was and we do not.

How did he come to recognize it? That question leads us into the whole history of John the Baptist, and we had better take it in three parts: 1. John in Private; 2. John in Public; 3. John in Prison.

1. First, let us think of John in Private. His introduction is startling enough. 'He was in the deserts till the day of his showing unto Israel.' In the deserts—what had sent John there? Was his nature so untamable that he shunned the haunts of men? It was not so. He was sent into the deserts, as Jesus was driven into the wilderness, by the Spirit of God. John was the son of a priest; his home was a godly home, and we may believe that the Spirit used the Word of God, so diligently read in that home, to drive John into the deserts.

We may suppose that he had been reading the Old Testament. Now the Old Testament has but two words to say to any man who reads it: 'God' and 'Sin.' In the Old Testament John learns that there is a God with whom he has to do, and that his relation to that God is Sin. He is in the condition of the Psalmist, and he sees nothing in the Old Testament but the Psalmist's cry, 'Gainst thee only have I sinned.' The Spirit of God has made the reading of the Old Testament effective in sending John into the deserts.

When John was sent into the deserts, if we read his story aright, he was at enmity with God. He remained in the deserts till he found peace. He found peace in repentance. Then when repentance came, there came the fruits that showed repentance real, and John became a Forerunner. He found his special purpose in life along the lines of his experience. He did not know, we may be sure that he did not know, how he was to fulfil his purpose and be a Forerunner, till he found himself preaching what he had felt. John came saying, 'Repent,' not because he would be a Forerunner, but because he had himself found peace in repenting. And as he cried, 'Repent,' preaching his own experience, he found himself fulfilling the ancient prophecy, 'Behold, I send my messenger before thy face.'

2. John in Public. When John appeared in

public he made a sensation: 'Then went out unto him Jerusalem and all Judæa.' He made such a sensation that they remembered him long afterwards. Secular persons like Josephus remembered him better than they remembered Jesus. What was it in John that touched them? His leathern girdle and camel's-hair coat? The question is not an idle one, for Jesus asked it; but that is not the answer. There was nothing so unusual in a camel's-hair coat and a leathern girdle. But John's reality was unusual. When Jesus began preaching this was His power also and the joy of the people in Him. He spake not as the Scribes. Neither did John speak as the Scribes. He spoke out of his own vivid experience. This voice which cried in the wilderness was a voice carrying a Burden as surely as ever Elijah or any other prophet carried a Burden.

His reality gave him boldness. And this also became an element in his popularity. When the soldiers asked him, half in jest perhaps, 'And what shall we do?' he told them to be content with their wages. The laugh was turned against them and the brave Baptist was more popular than ever. But his boldness cost him his liberty at last.

Herod Antipas heard of him, and then went to hear him. There was a religiousness in all the Herods. They would not have succeeded with the Jews so well as they did if they had not had an interest in religion. Herod heard John, heard him gladly, and did many things which John bade him do. And that is the test of a man's earnestness in religion and in hearing sermons. But one day John's boldness carried him very far. He reproved Herod for living in adultery with Herodias, his brother Philip's wife. And Herod sent John to prison.

3. John in Prison. He won it by his courage. If the rebuke was in public, as is altogether likely, we can imagine Herod's surprise; we can imagine how Herodias, sitting by him, bit her lip in

anger. 'It is not lawful for thee to have her:' and John was sent to prison. Had he left his proper purpose and calling in life then? Not so. This was part of the Forerunner's business. And it will not do for you or me to say it is none of our business. If we dread the prison extremely, we may perhaps escape it by judicious and very private admonishing. But whether it be adultery or strong drink, it *is* our business. And if we win our prison we shall win it well. John won his prison well, and it was worth the winning.

But not for a time. At first, and for a time it seemed as if he had won his prison to lose everything else. It was when he was in prison that John sent two of his disciples to Jesus to ask, 'Art thou he that should come, or look we for another?'

This is the most significant event in John the Baptist's life—most significant both for him and for us. This event tells us that his work as Forerunner was not ended when he was cast into prison. It was ended so far as Jerusalem and all Judæa was concerned. It was not ended for himself, for his disciples, or for us.

This event tells us also that a man may be even a Forerunner and not understand Christ. He may be sent from God, may find out that for which he is sent, and may do it, and yet be himself a castaway. It is a great step in life to recognize the purpose for which life and a place in the world is given. It is not the greatest step. It often makes a man great. It does not make him the greatest. Great as he is, and great as is the step he has taken, if he takes no other step, he that is least in the kingdom of God is greater than he.

John's disappointment in Christ was due to his being before Christ. It was due to his being the Forerunner. As the Forerunner he had to prepare men's hearts for Christ by repentance. And as he understood Christ, he understood that if men repented (and proved the sincerity of it by good

works) they would be safe from the judgment that threatened them. If they did not repent—why, Jesus was at hand with the axe of judgment already lifted up. He was at hand with the fan and the fire. John misunderstood Jesus. He thought the Father had sent the Son into the world to condemn the world, and not that the world through Him might be saved.

Surely we misunderstand the greatness of John the Baptist when we attribute his message from the prison to weakness or disappointment. Surely we misunderstand his mission as the Forerunner. What sign did ever John give either of weakness or of vanity? It was not himself, it was God and the world that John was thinking about. 'Art thou he; or do we—all of us—look for another?' The two disciples came to Jesus. He was busy doing the work that the Father had sent Him into the world to do. He was busy doing the work that had disappointed John. He was not taking vengeance. He was seeking and saving. 'John Baptist hath sent us: Art thou he?'

Jesus went on with His work. The blind came and were healed. The lepers came and were cleansed. The dead were carried in and went away with their friends. Jesus encouraged them to come. He welcomed them. He went and sought them out. And when those who were least considered in Israel then, those from whom least was expected, and for whom only a certain fearful looking for of judgment was supposed to be in store, when the poor (what a word it was and is) came near enough, good news was preached to them also, and never a word of the fire and the axe. Then He turned to the disciples of John: 'Go, tell him what you have seen and heard.'

Have you ever considered John receiving the message there in the prison, and thinking? All that they brought was in keeping with what he had heard. It was just on this account that he had sent the two disciples to ask. Was it meant as

insult then? John heard the message, and he had time in the prison to think?

He understood. How can we doubt that he understood? What else was the prison won for? What else was the message sent for? He understood that he had been sent, not before the strong wind and the earthquake, as he had supposed, but before the still small voice; not before the axe and the fire, but before the gospel to the poor. He had preached repentance and judgment to come. Jesus also preached repentance, but his long-suffering was not weary yet. John preached repentance and the axe; Jesus preached repentance and the Kingdom. And yet John understood now that Jesus demanded more than he.

For John demanded repentance and amendment of life: Jesus demanded repentance and a change

of heart. John demanded reformation; Jesus demanded regeneration. It was plain to see that the life must be amended, that the tax-gatherers must no longer extort, that the soldiers must no longer do violence. And if the axe was already at the root of the tree, the amendment could not be too speedy. Jesus began at the heart, touched the affections, drew forth the inalienable capacity of man to love, brought the human heart in contact with His own. The amendment will come. It may be longer in showing itself; but it will last longer; and He can wait. 'If thou art he that should come, where is the axe?' said John.' The axe is become a hand to touch the leper, a voice to preach the gospel to the poor.

John understood. He had won his prison nobly, and now he saw that it was worth the winning.

The Secret of the Triumph of Christianity over the Ancient World.

BY PROFESSOR G. GRÜTZMACHER, PH.D., HEIDELBERG.

ALL attempts of the Imperial power of Rome to destroy Christianity by fire and sword had come to nought. Hundreds of victims had been sacrificed, but the Christian faith could not be slain. Phœnix-like it ever rose from the ashes. But a similar failure attended also the efforts to ally it with heathen cults—efforts fraught with greater peril to Christianity—which preceded or showed themselves simultaneously with the persecutions. In vain had that religious libertine on the throne of the Cæsars, Heliogabalus (218–222), invited the Christians to worship Christ as their God in the temple of his Syrian god, from whom he derived his name. In vain had the noble emperor Alexander Severus (222–235) sought to introduce a peculiar mixed religion, in which he also assigned a place to Christ. This was the first emperor who showed not merely toleration but a real sympathy for the Christians. His mother, Julia Mammæa, had caused the great Christian theologian, Origen, to

come to Antioch, that she might discuss with him the immortality of the soul; and Alexander Severus set up in his palace two oratories, in which he practised the cult of the saints of paganism. In the first a place was given to divine men of a less perfect type, such as Cicero and Virgil; in the second were set up the images of his ancestors, the best of the deified emperors and of holy souls, among whom, side by side with Apollonius of Tyana, Orpheus, and Alexander the Great, admittance was accorded to Abraham and Christ. Thither the emperor betook himself every morning before commencing the business of state, to find edification in presence of all that humanity had produced of what was noble, great, and holy. Possessed of a soul mystically inclined, with high culture and fine feeling, he found there religious enjoyment in spiritual communion with all the great souls of the past whom he could love and reverence. But noble as were the intentions

of this ruler, they had not and could not have any success. All who yearned for an embodiment of the Divine in the human, turned more and more, as time went on, to the crucified and God-exalted Son of Man, whose wonderfully simple history gave men's hearts the certainty that here God has truly manifested Himself in the flesh. Alexander Severus had brought them to the threshold of the sanctuary. His little oratory with its mystical semi-darkness speedily changed into a light and lofty temple with its gate thrown open wide. The figure of Jesus Christ freed itself from associations with Apollonius of Tyana, Orpheus, and Alexander the Great, and towered far above the heroes of the ancient world. And the same figure opposed itself with equal energy to all attempts of the Gnostics to transform it into mere abstractions; it retained flesh and blood, and the conquering Church invested it with the most glorious halo.

With Constantine, Christianity ascended the Roman throne, although this emperor continued outwardly a catechumen all his life, not suffering himself to be baptized till he lay upon his death-bed. After the victory of Constantine over his colleague, Licinius (323), the triumph of Christianity in the Roman Empire was decided. The Church historian, Eusebius, has drawn a picture of the first Christian emperor, in which all the dark features in this brilliant career are either omitted or softened. Blinded like most of his contemporaries, Eusebius could not judge Constantine fairly. In the estimation of the latter, who, like his father, was a convinced monotheist, religion underlay all the various religions, but afterwards he went deeper into Christianity, and showed a genuine interest in ecclesiastical affairs. Greedy of power and unscrupulous, he has the merit of having rightly understood the signs of the times and of having indicated to his followers the correct path in religious politics. As sole ruler he did not, indeed, make Christianity the religion of the State; but, while still tolerating the old gods, he granted privilege upon privilege to the Christian Church and repressed paganism. With clear statesmanlike penetration he recognized that the Christians alone could give the tottering State the support which it urgently required. But the sudden and unlooked for change of conditions had also pernicious results for Christianity. The emperor had constituted himself lord and director of the Church, and the bishops bowed submissively to the will of the

ruler. The profane crowd, who had kept aloof from the martyr church, were attracted by a church endowed with rich privileges; and the moral level of the congregations sank visibly.

The sons of Constantine took sharper measures against paganism than their father. The heathen system, however, maintained its hold in the lowest strata of society, amongst the rural population, as well as in the highest circles, amongst the old Roman nobility. Both these grades of society clung tenaciously to the traditional religious faith; the one, because, naturally attached to the old and the traditional, they could not readily adjust their view-point to what was new; the other, because to them patriotism and mental culture were coincident with adherence to the ancient faith. Then came a brief period of reaction. Julian the Apostate, the nephew of Constans, ascended the throne in the year 361. This same emperor Constans, who had been the murderer of his kindred and the foe of his life, had shut the temples, prohibited the sacrifices, and well-nigh destroyed the old worship of the gods. Thus the youth, who had enjoyed a Christian training, early conceived a thorough aversion for Christianity. As ruler it was his aim to gain for a refined paganism the victory over Christianity. The dreams of poets and the speculations of philosophers were now to become living realities. Himself severely moral, he led the life of a strict ascetic, preaching moderation to a luxurious age. And yet he had soon to discover the utter futility of his policy. The great Alexandrian bishop, Athanasius, kept together the Christian Church, which Julian sought to tear asunder by his toleration of heretical movements. Although Athanasius had staked his whole life to secure the victory in the Church for the dogma of the *homoousia* of the Son with the Father, as what alone conserved the dignity of Jesus Christ as Redeemer, he was now broad-minded enough and prudent enough to sink petty differences, and in the time of need to conclude an alliance with the leaders of the new orthodoxy. A noble nature, an unbending character such as the times required, hated by his enemies, esteemed and loved by his followers, Athanasius was the man who gave steadfastness to the Christian Church. Julian, the blinded epigone of a great human epoch that was passing away, met a glorious death in the Persian war. Even if it is only a Christian legend that has put in the mouth

of the dying emperor the words, 'Galilæan, thou hast conquered!' these express the deepest truth. Christ had in fact conquered; the world's history is the world's judgment. This extended beyond the unhappy emperor, and the airy framework of a reformed heathen church which he had constructed was laid low as by a whirlwind.

In Julian the family of Constantine died out, and there followed a series of Christian emperors who accorded an honourable toleration to the heathen cults as well. Magical sacrifices alone were, with the assent of enlightened pagans, interdicted. The emperor Gratian, in conjunction with his Eastern colleague, Theodosius, was the first to abandon the hitherto practised policy of toleration of the heathen religion. Gratian had grown up under episcopal influences, and the amiable but weak Imperial youth was controlled even as ruler by Ambrose, the bishop of Milan. With the dignity and the consciousness of rank of an aristocrat, Ambrose united the energy of a true religious champion. An imperative sense of duty made him a genuine prince of the Church, while a delicate and profound knowledge of men constituted him a true pastor. The same man who gained the great Augustine to the Catholic Church, steeled the powers of resistance of a yielding prince against all the attempts of the heathen nobility to win the emperor to their side. In spite of their profession of Christianity, the emperors, from Constantine onwards, had retained the dignity of a heathen high priest (*pontifex maximus*). Gratian was the first to lay this aside. He also caused the altar of Victory to be removed from the *curia* of the Roman Senate. Then the heathen party rose once more, led by Ambrose's cousin, Q. Aurelius Symmachus. An enthusiastic patriot for the antique, he besought the emperor on behalf of the wasted temples and the desecrated altars. A noble character, an amiable personality, an upright statesman, a kind and conscientious father, he lacked faith in his own cause. A religious sceptic, he had no real interest except in sport and games. When we compare his extant correspondence with that of his Christian contemporary, Jerome, we are struck with the immense spiritual inferiority of this best of Romans. Although Symmachus in more than one respect stands morally higher than Jerome, the latter has upon his side ability, energy, and a living faith, which, in spite of its grotesque form and its being coupled with fanaticism, pos-

sesses world-subduing power. Paganism, as it aged, sank lower every day, and the Roman aristocracy, the women in particular, turned from the ancient deities to the crucified God. The breach with the old sensuous life completed itself in the sharpest form; noble Roman ladies like Marcella, Paula, and her daughter Eustochium, became nuns; senators like Pammachius, consulars like Paulinus of Nola, became monks. And the rise of the ascetic movement above all enriched the world of women with privileges that cannot be too highly estimated. Now it was possible for women to satisfy their mental and religious interests by taking Bible lessons under the guidance of so learned a man as Jerome.

The emperor Gratian had died in 383. Shortly before his death he had promulgated a fresh enactment, under which the penalty of going over to paganism or Judaism was the loss of the privileges of Roman citizenship. Accordingly, when Valentinian II., at the age of thirteen, ascended the throne, Symmachus approached the emperor once more, and besought him to revoke the anti-pagan decrees. 'He should distinguish the faith of ancient Rome, which conquered the world, from his private religion. Since man has no certain knowledge of Divine things, he must hold fast to the authority of antiquity.' But this patriotic petition availed nothing. Ambrose strengthened the hands of the emperor, and Valentinian gave the decidedly adverse reply, that he meant to spare the Christian religion and the memory of his brother Gratian. Hand in hand at first with Gratian, and then with Valentinian, the emperor Theodosius in the East extirpated heathenism by sharp measures. The Catholic Church became identified with the State religion, and any going over to heathenism was forbidden. Yet this powerful emperor had to bend before the Christian bishop, Ambrose, who excluded him from Church fellowship, and compelled him to do penance publicly when Theodosius had quenched in blood the flames of the revolt at Thessalonica. In spite, however, of this temporary collision between the secular and the ecclesiastical power, the relation between Ambrose and Theodosius continued friendly down to the death of the emperor. 'I loved the man,' says Ambrose, 'who was merciful and humble in the use of his power, and who had a pure and broken heart. I loved the man who in the Church publicly bewailed the sin into which the wiles of others

had led him. I loved the man who listened more to reason than to flattery. The step from which shame would have deterred a private person, the emperor was not ashamed to take, namely, to submit to public church discipline, as afterwards he never ceased to lament his error. Nay, on account of the blood shed on the occasion of his brilliant victory in the civil war, he voluntarily separated himself from the enjoyment of the Holy Supper until the arrival of his son, so earnestly expected, assured him of the return of the Divine favour. I loved the man who, on his deathbed, desired to see me, who in breathing his last was more concerned about the Church than about the welfare of his own.'

When, upon the death of Theodosius in 395, the empire was divided between his sons Honorius and Arcadius, the Imperial prestige sank ever lower, owing to the incursions of barbarians in the West and the East. No one had any longer clean hands and a pure conscience, or any delicate natural disposition. But in the Western Church there rose characters of great strength. The greatest of these was Augustine. In darkness and distress he had vainly turned for peace to Cicero, to the morally strict Manichæans, to Aristotle, and to Neo-Platonism. He had been guilty of serious moral aberrations, until at last he found steadfastness and strength in the Catholic Church. The well-known motto, which he himself prefixed to the sketch of his life in his *Confessions*, expresses all the greatness of this Christian character: 'Great art Thou, O Lord, and greatly to be loved. Thou hast made us for Thyself, and our heart is restless till it rests in Thee.' No one since the days of the Apostle Paul has exercised such influence upon posterity; no one did more to pave the way for the decisive victory of Christianity over effete paganism; none had such a share as he in rescuing all that was valuable in the ancient system and bestowing upon Christianity the heritage of antiquity. In the year 426 he finished his 'apology' for the Kingdom of God, in which he sought to show that Christianity was not responsible for the misery of the times. The prestige of the emperor sank, but that of the Christian bishop rose. This condition of things is eloquently witnessed to by the decree of the emperor Valentinian III. addressed to the bishop of Rome, Leo I. the Great, in the year 475: the empire is hastening to its end, let all eyes be turned to the Bishop of Rome.

To him the providential task was assigned of keeping safe in the ark of the Church whatever in the ancient system was capable of life, until the deluge of popular migrations was over.

With more severity in the East than in the West it was sought to destroy the last remnants of heathenism. The bigoted emperor Theodosius II., who had himself consecrated as a priest, sent monks with full Imperial powers into all provinces of the empire to persecute the heathen. The noble heathen lady philosopher, Hypatia, was trampled to death by the Christian mob of Alexandria (445), not without blame on the part of the bishop, Cyril. In 448 all heathen polemical writings directed against Christianity were ordered to be burned. The Church teachers, like the three Cappadocians, the high-souled Chrysostom, the heterodox idealist, Synesius of Cyrene, who trusted for the victory of Christianity to its spiritual power, had their place taken by wild fanatics, who laid it upon the emperors as a matter to conscience to destroy heathenism by fire and sword. But the truth that the pagan faith was dying out was widened plainly by the circumstance that it had not the energy to oppose martyrdoms to the triumphant advance of Christianity. The emperor Justinian abolished the ancient festal games, and in 529 closed the philosophers' school at Athens. Its last spiritual rallying-point was thus taken from paganism. The light of heathen philosophy was extinguished, the dying hour of heathenism in the Græco-Roman empire had come.

If now we raise the question, What were the forces that led to the triumph of Christianity over the world of antiquity? the answers given vary greatly, according to one's own attitude to the Christian faith. So confirmed a scoffer as the poet Heine says: 'The desperate condition of humanity in the time of the Cæsars explains the success of Christianity. The suicide of noble Romans, who all at once gave up the world, was frequent in those days. Those who lacked courage for this act had recourse to the slow suicide of the religion of self-abnegation. Slaves and unhappy people were the earliest Christians. Through their numbers and new-born fanaticism they became a force, which Constantine comprehended, and the Roman spirit of rule quickly made itself master of it, and disciplined it by dogma and cultus.' And a famous professor of

our own day pronounces this judgment on the victory of Christianity: 'Christianity would never have made its way in a single lane in Jerusalem, if it had not allied itself with the Greek philosophy.' As believing Christians we see the hand of God in this historical process whereby the preaching of the crucified One achieved the victory over the proud wisdom of paganism. The most remarkable feature is that, in spite of all human aberrations and all human fanaticism, God farthered His cause and used even doubtful characters for the extension of His kingdom.

The religious and philosophical development in paganism had ended in the most decided idealism. The lively interest in a tenable spiritual religion had given birth to Neo-Platonism, the last great philosophical system of antiquity. This took its rise at the beginning of the third century A.D. But the final conclusion of Greek wisdom was that we can attain to no correct knowledge, that we must believe. Neo-Platonism despaired of solving the highest problems by observing the world with the resources at the command of human reason. Only a profound God-inspired intelligence, so it proclaimed, can penetrate the mystery of the world. The world of phenomena is only appearance, true being lies beyond this world, the Godhead alone has true existence. But the way to deity is through asceticism, self-abnegation. What the Neo-Platonism of antiquity wearied to death preached as the ideal of life was not the conquest, but the renunciation of the world. In this Neo-Platonic school the religions and the cultus-forms of antiquity were conserved, being regarded as the popular forms of expression for communion with the Deity or with some lower intermediate being, and appreciated as revelations of the Divine. But in spite of this spiritualizing of the heathen faith, it was overcome by Christianity. And if the reasons for this be asked, the first and principal is that Neo-Platonism lacked the Person of the Saviour. It is true that the life of the philosopher Apollonius of Tyana was worked up by Philostratus into the life of a heathen Messiah, but this pagan rival saviour had to pale before the picture of the Son of God, which, in spite of all over-colouring by ecclesiastical legends, was preserved in the simple and moving narrative of the Gospels. A system of profound doctrines could not save men, but to the Person of Christ was attached the recognition of sin and of the holiness of God, and

in the Person of Christ was bestowed the pardon of sin and strength for a life in God. Neo-Platonism remained the religion of the upper ten thousand, intelligible only to them; the emperor Julian strove in vain to make it popular with the masses. The gospel of Christ offered to all comfort, peace, strength; Divine wisdom had discovered a form in which it was accessible to all. All ages, both sexes, all ranks, all peoples, wise and unwise, rich and poor, found their place in the Christian brotherhood. Neo-Platonism separated men by a gulf that could not be bridged from the eternal unknowable Deity. Only for a brief period and only for the elect was it possible to enter in enthusiastic rapture into communion with the Deity, but Christianity pointed the way to an enduring and constant fellowship with the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ on the basis of faith. Neo-Platonism, which stood intellectually so high, spoke with the tongues of men and of angels, but it remained sounding brass and a clanging cymbal. Neo-Platonism did not fashion its followers to be martyrs, Christianity gave its adherents the strength to suffer and thereby also to conquer.

Christianity, to be sure, had lost much of its primitive strength and purity. In the conflict with heathenism—for in every honourable spiritual struggle the conqueror adopts something from the conquered—the influences of polytheism had not failed to leave traces on the Christian Church. The superstitious veneration of relics and the worship of saints had forced their way into the Church. Also the social contrasts of high and low, and the distinction between clergy and laity make their presence felt. The picture of the Christian body drawn by the old apologist Aristides about the year 150, now belonged to the past: 'The Christians,' Aristides boasts, 'comfort those who have troubled them, and make friends of their foes and do them good. Their wives are as virgins, and their daughters chaste. Slaves, male and female or children, they persuade to become Christians, out of love to them, and when they have done so, they call them brothers without distinction. Falsehood is not found among them, they love one another.' The pictures which Chrysostom and Jerome have sketched for us of the Christianity of the great cities of their day, are far darker. The most hateful motives are often at work with candidates for the priesthood

or the diaconate. For instance, a man might become a priest in order to have more freedom to associate with women. At the same time there was a reign of foppery among the clergy. With many it was the greatest concern whether their clothes were well scented and their boots tight and neatly fitting. Their hair was curled with the tongs, and their fingers sparkled with rings. When such a *bon vivant* in clerical attire got up at sunrise, he first drew up a plan of the order of his visits. He considered the shortest roads, and a shameless grey head intruded almost into the sleeping apartments of matrons. If his eye lighted upon a beautiful cushion or an elegant handkerchief, he would praise and admire it. Then he would complain that it was just such a thing he wanted, and, although he did not actually demand it, he finally extorted it, because every woman was afraid of offending the city courier, who, with barbarously bold mouth, repeated everywhere the city gossip. The Christian emperors saw themselves compelled to make laws against the legacy-hunting of the clergy, laws whose necessity even an Ambrose and a Jerome do not dispute but bewail.

At the same time, it would be quite perverse to treat these features as universal, and to depict the condition of Christianity as wholly corrupt and degenerate. The monastic movement, which was directed against the growing luxury of the Church, produced Christian characters of heroic self-denial, who retired from the world's din to live to their God in the bosom of nature. And there were still priests like Chrysostom who realized as far as is possible for man the high ideal of the priesthood which he himself has sketched, who conquered the solicitations of the flesh, the dangers of a love of power, of pride and vanity, who in their priestly mediatorial capacity united earth and heaven, who carried the whole world in praying hearts, and who realized amongst men the work of redemption, namely, to be divine and to make divine. In an age when celibacy was considered the highest Christian ideal of life, there were Christian mothers like Monica, the mother of Augustine, who prayed unceasingly to God for her son, and had no rest until the son of her tears had turned from the error of his ways to God. There were still bishops who, like Athanasius and Hilary, preferred exile and forsook fatherland and friends rather than deny their faith; like Ambrose and Augustine, who as true shepherds and pastors preached the gospel to

themselves and their flocks. The spirit of Jesus Christ was still mighty in His Church, and it was this spirit of the glorified Lord that conquered the world of antiquity. No true historical investigation will ever deny that the faith which through Christ lives in God and with God subdued the ancient world. And with this faith was coupled love, which had its most brilliant manifestations just in the era when the Church was achieving its triumphs. It was the Christian Church that first instituted hospitals for sick and suffering humanity. Upon the model of the institutions founded by the bishops Eustathius of Sebaste and Basil of Cæsarea there arose all over the world places where Christian brotherly love celebrated quiet but glorious triumphs by its care for the poor and its nursing of the sick. In the port of Rome and on the road to Bethlehem pilgrim hostels were established. Wealth discovered a nobler employment than that of ministering to sensual appetites. And even when Christians mingled in the life of the world, they did not lose sight of the object of their hopes, but remembered that they are pilgrims who, while on earth, remain ever imperfect, but are journeying to the Jerusalem above, into which God will receive those who love Him and have been faithful to Him.

Finally, let us sum up once more what we have said. What was the secret of the triumph of Christianity over the ancient world? The heathen cults left the religious feelings unsatisfied; the heathen mysteries awakened, indeed, in the heart longings after redemption, but their mystical rites did not contain what they promised; the heathen philosophy preached, indeed, redemption by the path of self-abnegation, but it failed to supply the strength for self-redemption; the belief in the old world of deities and their myths, which men sought to conserve by transforming its meaning, was shattered at once by criticism and by septicism. Christianity took away from man the vain dream of self-redemption and pointed him to Jesus Christ as the Saviour sent by God into a world of sin. Christianity produced heroes of faith, who gave to this faith forcible expression in the realm of thought as well as of life, who firmly trusting in God counted the world as nothing and overcame the world. Christianity set loose the powers of active brotherly love, which helped to transform the ancient world, with its regardless egoism and its deification of man, into a brotherhood of redeemed children of God.

Problems in the Gospels.

BY PROFESSOR THE REV. C. A. BRIGGS, D.D., LITT.D., UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, NEW YORK.

II.

The Twelve and the Seventy.

THE Gospels of Mark and Matthew give the sending forth of the Twelve, the Gospel of Luke the sending forth of both the Twelve and the Seventy. The Gospel of John says nothing about either event, does not mention the Seventy at all. It mentions the Twelve only twice, and even these passages may be redactional. But, on the other hand, this Gospel gives a group of seven disciples, and mentions several names not known to the Synoptists. These differences raise several difficult questions.

The story of Mark (6⁷⁻¹³) is simple. The sending forth of the Twelve in pairs to preach repentance and work miracles is given without explicit motive. The story of the death of John the Baptist is inserted (6¹⁴⁻²⁹). Then the return of the Twelve is given in connexion with the feeding of the multitudes (6³⁰⁻⁴⁶).

The story of Luke (9¹⁻⁶) is evidently based on Mark, and gives nothing additional of any importance. But Luke also gives an account of the sending forth of the Seventy (10¹⁻¹⁶) and their return (10¹⁷⁻²⁴) in connexion with a large amount of material usually supposed to belong to the Peræan ministry, unknown for the most part to Matthew and Mark, and evidently derived from a source unknown to these Evangelists.

A large amount of the material, in the form of logia, spoken by Jesus in connexion with the sending forth and the return of the Seventy, is given by Matthew in connexion with the mission and return of the Twelve (10¹⁻¹¹ and 11²⁰⁻²⁷). Between these is inserted the sending of the disciples of the Baptist to Jesus (11²⁻¹⁹), given by Luke elsewhere. In fact, as I have shown, Matthew heaps up in this section a number of logia connected with the ministry of the disciples, not only those uttered by Jesus according to Luke on these two different occasions, but also some belonging to the final commission of the Twelve before His departure from the world to the Father (*The Apostolic Commission*, Article I. 'Studies in Honour of B. L. Gildersleeve'). Many of the logia scattered through

those chapters of Luke which are peculiar to him, are found in Matthew attached to his versions of the Sermon on the Mount, the Woes of the Pharisees, and the Eschatological Discourse, all derived from the Logia of Matthew by our Gospels of Matthew and Luke, notwithstanding this difference in the grouping of the material.

There is no sufficient reason why we should doubt the mission of this second group of disciples by Jesus. It is altogether probable that the Twelve were commissioned for a Galilean ministry, the Seventy for a Peræan and Judæan ministry. It is a common opinion that Jesus was accompanied by the Twelve throughout His ministry, and that their absence from Him was quite brief. This opinion is due doubtless to the fact that the return from their mission is given in the narrative so close to the sending forth. But this, as in the case of the Seventy also, was due to topical reasons, and by no means implies the close proximity in time of the sending and the return. This mission, if it amounted to anything, must have continued several weeks at least.

There are in the Gospels of Matthew and Mark many instances of calls to a special following of Jesus connected with the abandonment of all things else, some accepted, others rejected—calls which imply a larger circle of special disciples than the Twelve, and which, therefore, incidentally sustain another and a larger group of ministers, such as the Seventy of Luke. Only thus can we get a basis in the life of Jesus for the two groups of the apostolic history, the Twelve and the larger group of prophets such as Barnabas, Ananias, Joseph, and Matthias, the latter of whom was assigned the place of Judas in the group of the Twelve. The term *apostle*, as I have shown elsewhere (*Apostolic Commission*), was not used by Jesus, but was first given at Antioch in connexion with the mission of Barnabas and Paul, and was a comprehensive term which was used indifferently for both of these groups.

A careful study of the Gospels shows us that there was indeed a natural and simple development in the calling, training, and sending forth of the ministry by Jesus during His lifetime. The

synoptic narrative tells of the call of the four fishermen and of Matthew. The narrative of John tells us of the call of Andrew and Simon, Philip and Nathanael, and a fifth, probably John. Nathanael is usually regarded as another name for Bartholomew of the Synoptists; but this is by no means certain. How and when the others named among the Twelve were called by Jesus we are not told. But it was not long before a group of Twelve was selected with Peter at the head (Mk 3¹³⁻¹⁹, Mt 10²⁻⁴, Lk 6¹²⁻¹⁹).

The Sermon on the Mount, so called, according to the version of Luke, which is nearest to the original, was a discourse of consecration. Matthew has attached to it a large amount of material gathered from the Logia of Matthew, given by the other Synoptists on many other different occasions.

After continuing with Jesus as a group of Twelve for some considerable time, they were sent forth in pairs to conduct missions throughout Galilee. At this time Jesus gave them a solemn charge. This mission continued until shortly before the last journey of Jesus to Jerusalem.

It is probable that one of these pairs always remained with Jesus; at one time John and James, at another Andrew and Peter, at another Matthew and Thomas. But the Twelve, as a whole, were absent on their mission from this time forth until they rejoined Jesus just prior to the feeding of the multitudes, which was only a short time before the Passion of Jesus, and not in the midst of His ministry, as is commonly supposed.

In the meanwhile, Jesus was attaching other disciples to Himself besides the Twelve by special calls, and preparing them for a special ministry. Before setting forth upon His Peræan ministry, He organizes Seventy of these in a group and sends them forth in pairs to prepare the way before Him in Peræa and in Judæa. These also return to Him, probably on His last passage along the border of Peræa on His way to Jerusalem.

The mission of the Seventy is not reported in Mark because that Gospel depends upon the preaching of Peter, and Peter seems to have limited his testimony to that which he himself had seen and heard. He was not present during the Peræan and Judæan ministry of Luke and John, and therefore makes no report of it, or of the work of the Seventy, with which he had nothing to do.

The Gospel of Matthew is based on Mark and

the Logia of Matthew, which latter, as I have shown in my articles on the 'Wisdom of Jesus' (THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, June, July, August, November 1897), was simply a collection of the wisdom of Jesus with occasional introductory incidents, but without historical narrative. These the author of our Gospel of Matthew arranged as best he could in groups on the basis of Mark's narrative. He had no knowledge of the special sources used by Luke and John, or of the historical material given in those sources.

If the order in the development of the ministry given above is correct, we have an important help for the arrangement of the material relating to the life of Jesus.

1. The calling of disciples to follow Jesus in a life involving an abandonment of all else.
2. The selection of Twelve of these into a special group, and their solemn setting apart.
3. The mission of these Twelve to Galilee.
4. The selection of a larger group of Seventy, and their consecration.
5. The mission of the Seventy to Peræa and Judæa.

6. The return of the Twelve near Bethsaida in order to accompany Jesus to His last Passover.

7. The return of the Seventy on His last journey along the border of Peræa to Jerusalem.

8. The final commission of the apostolic ministry.

If now we take this as a framework for the material given in the Gospels, it is evident that the usual arrangement of the harmonists is incorrect.

The material Mk 6⁸⁰-9 = Mt 14¹³-18 = Lk 9¹⁰⁻⁵⁰ does not precede Lk 10-18¹⁴, but follows it. Lk 18¹⁵⁻³⁴ coincides with Mk 10¹³⁻³⁴. The material inserted here in Luke between 9⁵⁰ and 18¹⁵ is material, apart from the logia, derived from another source unknown to Mark and Matthew. Luke does not mingle the material derived from this source with the material derived from Mark, but follows Mark essentially as far as 9⁵⁰, only changing the order occasionally for topical reasons, and then gives his new material entirely by itself. This new material, apart from the logia, belongs for the most part to the Peræan ministry, while Peter was absent from Jesus in Galilee. There is no sound reason which compels us to place this ministry subsequent to the entire Galilean ministry as the modern harmonists do.

The situation is similar with the material given in Jn 7¹-11⁶⁴. This is based on a source unknown

to the Synoptists. There is no sound reason why it should be placed between Mk 9⁵⁰ and Mk 10². The single intervening verse (10¹) may or may not correspond with Lk 9⁵¹. The passages are not so similar that a coincidence is evident. In the former Jesus goes into the borders of Jordan and Peræa. In the latter He goes steadfastly towards Jerusalem through Samaria, which is very different. The latter probably corresponds with the journey to the Feast of Tabernacles of Jn 7¹⁻¹⁸ to which He went up secretly through Samaria, the unusual route, to avoid the publicity of the usual route by

the valley of the Jordan. The former probably was much later, His last journey on which He cast all secrecy and prudence aside, and therefore went to Jerusalem by the usual route with all His disciples by way of the Jordan, Jericho, and Bethany.

This arrangement of the material gives a better development to the narrative, explains the silence of Mark as to the Peræan and Jerusalem ministry by the absence of Peter, whose preaching was the basis of Mark, and puts a new light upon many obscure problems.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Jesus Christ and Paul.¹

THE question, 'Is the theology of Paul a legitimate development of the teaching of Jesus?' which has so often been answered in the negative in the course of the last century, is met in this volume with a distinct affirmative. Professor Feine has no hesitation in tracing back all the main features of Pauline doctrine, or their germs, to the words of Jesus as handed down by tradition and the historical manifestation of the Lord, inclusive of the resurrection and ascension and revelation on the road to Damascus. He points out, indeed, occasionally a difference between the disciple and the Master. In relation to the goods of this world, for example, the apostle on whom devolved the organization of the Churches, whilst agreeing with the Lord in principle, laid more stress on that aspect of the question which admits of the use of the earthly for the advancement of the aims of the kingdom of God.

The work is arranged in three chapters, dealing seriatim with fundamentals and methods; the apostle's idea about his dependence on Jesus; and the facts of that dependence as set forth in our sources.

The first chapter briefly traces the history of the subject from Schleiermacher, who is held to have furnished the originating impulse, down to

the present time, points out some considerations to be borne in mind throughout the inquiry, deals at some length with the personality of Jesus, and defines the writer's attitude to the Gospels and the Pauline Epistles. All these topics are suggestively handled. We are reminded that all religious life is individual, never a mere repetition of another's. Paul was not, could not be, a mere embodiment of the nature of Christ, or a copy of Christ. Again, we must not lose sight of the distance religiously between the apostle and his Lord, and we must not restrict the historical manifestation of Christ to His earthly life, but must regard as belonging to it His death and resurrection and sovereign authority over His own. It is admitted that Jesus possessed in a sense an individual character, and was to some extent influenced by His age. Had this not been so He would have been a phantom, not a human being with flesh and blood, and would have been unable to exert historical influence. On the other hand, He cannot be grouped with the rest of men. Under different circumstances He exhibited different temperaments. He combined in perfect unity characteristics which are generally regarded as incompatible. He belonged in a certain sense to no age, no nation, neither sex. Both the masculine and feminine ideals receive their distinctive marks from Him. His image, wherever it is presented to-day, stands before men as vivid and life-giving as 1900 years ago. The reason is that in Jesus we have a religious life which is absolutely unique. Other

¹*Jesus Christus und Paulus.* Von D. Paul Feine, ordentlichem Professor der evangelischen Theologie in Wien. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung. M.6.

models can be excelled or have their limitations, but in Jesus the religious life lies before us in a form which is positively unattainable and cannot be surpassed. 'The influence which proceeds from this personal life of Jesus is based on the fact that in us too that lives as a glimmering spark which in Him was a clearly burning flame. Man has been made by God and for God. He reaches his appointed goal only when God's way (German, *Art*) has become his way. Now in the person of Jesus we meet with the divine more directly than anywhere else in the human world.' These few extracts give but an imperfect idea of a striking and eloquent study of the personality of Jesus. The sources for 'Jesus' are the four Gospels. The Fourth Gospel, however, although ascribed with confidence to the Apostle John, is less freely used than the Synoptic Gospels, because the Christ whom it portrays is 'Christ as He lived in the mind of the apostle after a long personal development which had been influenced by several decades of Christian history, by the theology of Paul, and by important elements of Greek thought.' Nevertheless, considerable use is made of this Gospel in some parts of the work. The Synoptic Gospels, too, are handled with considerable freedom. Even their contents cannot be accepted without reserve, as their writers also were affected by the interests and conflicts and development of the Church. Parables and symbols are therefore represented as historic events, the Old Testament has influenced the form, and legend has begun to attach itself to tradition. Still the evidence of the Synoptists is comparatively very faithful, and is well fitted to supply a solid foundation. For 'Paul' the sources are the Pauline Epistles and to some extent the Acts, especially the 'we-sections.' The Pastoral Epistles are not excluded, but are made use of only where they exhibit no deviations from the other Epistles.

One of the most valuable sections of the second chapter is an exhaustive study of the names of Christ met with in the Pauline Epistles. The statistics are briefly as follows :—

The name 'Jesus' by itself occurs 17 or 18 times, 'Christ' (with and without the article) 209 or 211 times and once in the Pastorals, 'Jesus Christ' 20 times and 3 times in the Pastorals, 'Christ Jesus' about 60 times and 24 times in the Pastorals, 'Lord' or 'The Lord' about 131 times and 13 or 15 times in the Pastorals,

'The Lord Jesus' or 'Our Lord Jesus' 24 or 26 times, 'Jesus our Lord' twice, 'Our Lord Christ' once, 'The Lord Christ' once, 'The Lord (or 'Our Lord') Jesus Christ' 47 times and twice in the Pastorals, 'Christ Jesus the Lord' (or 'Our Lord,' 'My Lord') 7 times and 3 times in the Pastorals, 'Jesus Christ our Lord' 4 times, 'The Son of God' 17 times. The most noticeable fact about these figures is the comparative rarity of the historical name 'Jesus' and the remarkable frequency of 'Christ.' Paul uses 'Christ' 12 times as often as 'Jesus,' 10 times as often as 'Jesus Christ,' 9 times as often as 'The Lord Jesus,' more than 4 times as often as 'The Lord Jesus Christ,' and more than 3 times as often as 'Christ Jesus.' From these facts it is inferred that the living exalted Christ controls the Christian thought of the apostle, Christ as He rules in royal power over believers, over the Church, and even over the world. But the most pronounced features of this image of Christ have been taken from the life and activity of Jesus on earth, inclusive of the resurrection. And we must go still further and say that for Paul the pre-existent Christ is one with the earthly and the exalted Christ. It may be added that the calculations are based on the third edition of Nestle's *N.T.*, 1901. Another interesting section of this chapter discusses Paul's relation to the historical tradition about Christ. The results arrived at are two—(1) that he was well acquainted with it; (2) that he worked it up completely in his own mind and then handled it as his own peculiar possession.

The very important section on the way in which the apostle felt the image of Christ to be a living power, contains among many other things of value the following fine sentence: 'Augustine rediscovered Christ's humility, and attached himself in his faith to the lowly Son of God: the interest of Bernard of Clairvaux was absorbed by Christ's passion, and that of Francis of Assisi by Christ's poverty; but we must combine these different rays of practical love to reproduce the image of the character of Jesus as it lived in the apostle's soul.'

The last chapter consists of two parts: the former considering problems in the life of Jesus; and the latter representing in twelve sections the dependence of Paul on Jesus. The problems are four. When did Jesus know Himself to be the Messiah? What was the relation of Jesus to the Old Testament? What was the significance of the

death of Jesus? Was the Gospel of Mark materially influenced by Pauline thought? The most remarkable section in the latter portion is that which treats at great length of the Eucharist. It is not pleasant reading for evangelical Protestants. Professor Feine firmly believes in 'the real presence,' in the Lutheran sense of the expression. He is quite confident that he has Paul on his side. The sacrament was for the apostle 'a memorial meal at which the body and blood of Christ are handed to be partaken of.' The sixth chapter of John is held to represent the same belief, although with some difference of detail. John and Paul 'agree in witnessing to an enjoyment in the Eucharist of the body and blood of Christ.' 'The Apostolic Church taught the real reception of the body and blood of Christ in the Eucharist.' In thus teaching they were in no way deviating from the doctrine of the Lord Himself. The words of installation teach the disciples 'that the bread which they are eating *is* His body, and that the wine which they are drinking *is* His blood, that is, the body given to death and the blood of the covenant shed in death.' The italics are the writer's. 'Bread and wine do not "signify" body and blood, but are that according to the meaning of the action of Jesus and the significance of the accompanying words.' And yet we read on the same page that 'bread and wine are not the bearers of the personality of Jesus,' but 'the representatives of His sacrificed life.' It is admitted that this is mysterious, and that it is hard to understand how Jesus could make this use of bread and wine. 'But that is His secret. It has not pleased Him to lift this veil for us. Faith in the power of His word, however, is able to overcome the difficulties which it suggests. The man who is without that faith will adopt other modes of explanation which do not harmonize with Christ's conduct and Christ's word.' But perhaps the veil referred to is non-existent except for High Church theologians. The prolixity with which the Eucharist is treated contrasts strongly with the meagreness of the section relating to Baptism—little more than a page over against thirty pages.

The work as a whole is an addition of solid value to the literature of the very important subject with which it deals. It is carefully and reverently written throughout, and has more style than many books produced by German professors.

It is, unhappily, not free from sectarian one-sidedness, but even that is preferable to the dreary negations of some recent criticism.

W. TAYLOR SMITH.

(Sevenoaks.)

Grill on the Fourth Gospel.¹

DR. GRILL'S standpoint in this notable contribution to N.T. theology is that of those who hope to aid the solution of the Johannine problem, not by working along the ordinary lines of literary or historical criticism, but by concentrating the attention primarily upon an examination of the recurring and primary ideas of the Fourth Gospel in the light of contemporary speculation and religion. *Life and light* he naturally picks out as the cardinal conceptions of Christ's person in the prologue (where they form the other side of the Logos-conception) and throughout the Book (pp. 5-31). In fact, *14* is the sum of the whole Gospel, and in elaborating this thesis Dr. Grill supplies a detailed convincing refutation of Harnack's attempt to isolate the prologue from what follows. The Logos-conception, he argues (31-38), dominates the whole Book, nor is it essentially Philonic (pp. 168-176). Abstract and speculative elements are steadily subordinated. The Logos-consciousness is the consciousness of Jesus throughout, who, as Logos, conveys through His personality light and life to men (pp. 87 f.). The Philonic correlation of Logos and *σοφία* (pp. 149 f.) leads, at this point, to an elaborate discussion (pp. 177 f.) of the latter term in pre-Christian, Christian, and gnostic literature, from which Dr. Grill argues that the curious avoidance of the term in the Fourth Gospel (a fact of very weighty moment) must have been due to the author's sense of repugnance to its dualistic associations in current phases of the gnostic theosophy. In place of *σοφία* the stress falls upon *ἀλήθεια* (pp. 207 f.), a term which is practically equivalent in the Johannine circle to 'spiritual reality': Jesus as 'the Truth' is simply the complete embodiment or expression (cf. 1¹⁷) of the divine grace and salvation. Dr. Grill is at his

¹ *Untersuchungen über die Entstehung des vierten Evangeliums.* Von Julius Grill. Erster Theil. Tübingen und Leipzig: Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1902. London and Oxford: Williams & Norgate. Pp. xii, 408. Price 8s.

best in the exhaustive accounts, which now follow, of *Life* (pp. 206 f.) and *Light* in their separate significance and relationship, of *Glory* and its semi-sensuous associations in the Fourth Gospel (pp. 313 f.), and of the Incarnation-idea (pp. 328 f.); whilst the last pages of his business-like and scholarly treatise are occupied with some not particularly relevant notes upon gnostic terminology.

The two outstanding features of the volume, apart from its width of reading and sanity of judgment, are the author's use of foreign religions, such as Hellenism and the Indian theosophies, to elucidate the Fourth Gospel—the chief defect being an inadequate recourse to Zoroastrianism,—and his splendid collection of Philonic parallels. The former, though happily not a unique trait of modern criticism, is very welcome. The latter furnishes the student with materials richer even than those exploited in this country by Dr. Abbott and Principal Drummond, or, in France, by J. Réville. Dr. Grill has evidently a thorough knowledge of his Philo, and he has made it a servant, not a fetish, with results for which the reader, even when he cannot follow his author, must ever and again feel heartily indebted. Until the second volume appears, it would be premature to pronounce any verdict upon the amount of permanent value in the author's treatment of the Fourth Gospel. Indeed, it is impossible as yet to see the exact line of positions which he proposes to fortify, though it is fairly plain that he takes the Fourth Gospel to presuppose and oppose gnostic propaganda. But the first part of his 'Studies' contains enough material to reward any student meanwhile, nor are the profits of this learned original book confined by any means to the particular theme of the Fourth Gospel and its theology. The *obiter dicta* are both numerous and varied. For example, in a discussion of Dn 7¹⁸ (pp. 50–57), he argues at length that 'one like a son of man' is some angelic being, a medium between God and the world and also 'a transcendent prototype (*urbild*) of that humanity, well pleasing to God, which is finally to be represented by the Holy people.' On pp. 330–334 he takes occasion to investigate the Birth-stories of Matthew and Luke, which the prologue tacitly rejects (p. 330); and notes on the terminology and ideas of the N.T. enrich almost every section. Perhaps, in consideration of the instruction and really fresh data which

these asides generally furnish (e.g. on the Pauline resurrection body, pp. 70–73, or the analysis of 1 John, pp. 301–305), it is ungracious to confess to a certain feeling of perplexity and disappointment, when one lays down the volume and endeavours mentally to gather together its precise results, as these bear upon the special writing indicated in its title. It is to be hoped that in the sequel, which one awaits with much interest, Dr. Grill will be able to focus his researches in a more positive, terse, and coherent fashion than he has allowed himself to do in the present treatise, where the spoils of detailed research, massed together in a style which is not conspicuous for lucidity, rather obscure, upon the whole, the disposition of valuable and suggestive thoughts. The 'prowling' faculty has its defects no less than its virtues in theological research as elsewhere.

JAMES MOFFATT.

Dundonald.

Grill on the Religion of Mithra.¹

IN this rectorial address, delivered in Tübingen on the Kaiser's birthday last February, Dr. Grill hardly manages to reach the 'und das Christenthum' of his title. This seems a pity, for what interests the public reached by writers so different as Réville and Mr. J. M. Robertson, is the precise relationship during the early centuries between the fashionable Mithra-cult and the faith which rose to rival and finally to supersede it. However, it is perhaps well to presuppose no great knowledge of Mithraism among ordinary readers, and the author engages to return to the larger subject later on. Meanwhile, he has popularized Cumont's researches by sketching in rough, rapid outline the rise, contents, and spread of the Mithra-cult, with its scheme of redemption, moral aims, sacraments, priesthood, brotherhood of believers, and mysteries. The lecture, written with breadth and competence and vigour, will perhaps invite some readers to go deeper into the subject for themselves. It is introductory and expository. But it will at any rate help most people to understand something of the formidable fascination, which writers like Justin and Tertullian

¹ *Die persische Mysterienreligion im römischen Reich und das Christenthum.* Von Julius Grill. 1903. No. 34 in J. C. B. Mohr's *Sammlung gemeinverständlicher Vorträge und Schriften aus dem Gebiet der Theologie und Religionsgeschichte.* Price 1s. 3d.

denounce, once exercised by the worship of a deity who seemed, in many striking features, to be a counterfeit and copy of the Christian Jesus.

JAMES MOFFATT.

Dundonald.

The New 'Herzog.'¹

IN vol. xii. of the Herzog-Hauck *Realencyklopädie* the range is from *Lutheraner* to *Methodismus*, the latter article by Dr. Loofs of Halle being a generous and sympathetic appreciation, all the more valuable because of the independence of its judgments and the candour and insight of its occasional criticisms.

Professor von Orelli of Basle treats with freshness and force the often discussed but unexhausted theme of the

MESSIAH.

The author's attitude towards critical questions is that of a moderate Conservative, but he is familiar with the arguments and conclusions of the more Liberal school, and states them fairly. Objections are sometimes raised against the Messianic interpretation of Isaiah's prophecies on the ground that later prophets, as, *e.g.*, Jeremiah and Ezekiel, do not present so detailed a picture. It is urged in reply that to expect them to do so is unreasonable. Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Zechariah write like men who desire to suggest and recall by a few strokes the form which earlier prophets had made familiar. In the prophecies of 'Deutero-Isaiah' a different figure appears upon the scene. Great is the contrast between the despised and rejected 'Servant of God' and the mighty and glorious King whose rule is depicted by Isaiah and Micah in glowing colours. Nevertheless, Franz Delitzsch has correctly defined the Servant of God as 'the mediator of salvation who is prophet, priest, and king in one person' (*Messianische Weissagung*, p. 161), and it must always be remembered that references to the lowly state of the elect King are not absent from the earlier prophecies. Even David as a type prefigures One who by suffering should glorify God. In Isaiah 11 and elsewhere the Messiah is described as of lowly origin.

On the difficult question of the application to the Messiah of passages which originally had no reference to Him, Professor von Orelli writes frankly and wisely. From the royal Psalms traits were added to the portrait of the coming King, for the most glorious historic reign had fallen far below the ideal prophetically sketched by Hebrew poets; in the Messianic kingdom these fair visions would be realized. In the period immediately preceding the advent of Christ it had become customary to read this deeper prophetic meaning into many passages, and to give a personal interpretation to words which in the first instance described the future glory of the nation.

At considerable length the passages in the non-canonical Jewish writings are examined in which there is any reference to the Messianic hope. Two reasons are assigned for their comparative silence on this theme: these books are chiefly historical and didactic, and they sprang from circles in which, at the time when they were written, expectations of a coming deliverer were faintly cherished. The latter reason has less application to *The Wisdom of Solomon* (100–50 B.C.), which dates from a period when the Messianic hope was stronger. But Hellenistic philosophy was not a favourable soil for its growth, and the passages in *Wisdom*, which speak of a future judgment (*e.g.* 3^{7ff.}), are of a 'somewhat uncertain, transcendental character,' and contain no reference to a personal Messiah. *Baruch* more closely resembles the prophetic writings of the Old Testament, especially Deutero-Isaiah, but though it describes (4^{21ff.} 5^{1ff.}) the restoration and glorious future of the nation, it makes no mention of the Son of David.

The pseudepigraphic writings contain evidence of a revival of the Messianic hope after the Macabean age. In the *Book of Enoch* Professor von Orelli distinguishes an original document (*Grund-schrift*) from a later addition (*cc.* 37–71), in which the descriptions of the Messiah and His kingdom are more elaborately wrought and more highly developed. A curious variant is noted in the Æthiopic version of a vision narrated in the earlier portion of this work. God is represented as dwelling in a new temple amidst the good sheep. A white bullock—the Messiah—is born; to it all the nations do homage. Afterwards the white bullock is transformed into a buffalo (𐤁𐤏𐤓 *ʾēm*) with black horns. The word for buffalo was merely transliterated in the Greek (ῥῆμ); the Æthiopic trans-

¹ *Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche*. Begründet von J. J. Herzog. Dritte Auflage. Herausgegeben von D. Albert Hauck. Band xii. Leipzig: Hinrichs.

lator read ῥῆμα, and rendered: 'The first among them was *the word*, and this word was a large beast.' The latter sentence was, doubtless, originally a marginal and explanatory gloss: '*ῥῆμα* is a large beast.'

The later sections (37-71) of the *Book of Enoch* are dated later than 38 B.C., and the possibility of their being much later is recognized. Attention is called to the following points of contrast with the original work. Heaven, not earth, is the abode of the blessed. There is a more transcendental conception of the kingdom of God: the Messiah dwells in heaven, surrounded by saints and angels; He is called 'the Son of Man' (46^{1st}), because of His human form, but in another place God calls Him 'my Son' (105²). The Messiah is regarded as the Mediator of all divine revelation to men; He will sit on His throne judging the secret things; by Him the dead will be raised and all men finally judged; the righteous shall rejoice with Him in eternal glory; but the wicked, especially kings and mighty men, shall be tormented in the flames of hell (62^{13ff.} 63¹⁰).

After quoting from the *Apocalypse of Baruch* and the *Apocalypse of Ezra*, Professor von Orelli proceeds to describe the main features of the portrait of the Messiah in the rabbinical writings. The Zealots taught the people to expect the intervention of the Messiah to save the temple from destruction; after the catastrophe there was a widespread expectation of His speedy appearing. Rabbi Akiba was deceived by Bar-cochba, and after his disillusionment said to Rabbi Jochanan: 'The grass will grow on your cheeks before the Messiah comes.' But the Rabbis in general looked for His coming in the present age rather than in the future. 'The days of the Messiah' would close the present dispensation; but Jerusalem instead of Rome would be the mistress of the world. Rabbi Eliezer said: 'Not even in the days of the Messiah will men cease to carry weapons, but only in the future age.' The close of the Messianic age—a strictly limited period—was to be followed by the destruction of the present order and the making of all things new. Before the birth of the new era Israel would suffer from plague, hunger, pestilence, earthquakes, and war; these things are 'the pangs of the Messiah.' In regard to the necessity of preparation for His advent there were two opposite opinions, both of which are represented in Rabbi Jochanan's words: 'The Son of David will come

only in the generation in which all are innocent, or in the generation in which all are guilty.' The more usual strain of teaching is represented by Rabbi Acha: 'If Israel were to repent for a single day, the Son of David would immediately come,' and by Rabbi Levi: 'If Israel were to observe one Sabbath according to the law, the Son of David would immediately come.'

The person of the Messiah is, as a rule, conceived of as human in the natural sense of the word. Some sayings have a polemic ring. Rabbi Abbahu said: 'If a man says to thee, "I am God," he lies; if he says, "I ascend to heaven," his word will not prove true.' On the other hand, there are passages in which a kind of pre-existence of the Messiah in heaven is taught. Rabbi Tanchuma mentions 'the name of the Messiah' as one of the six things that existed before the Creation; in *Bereschith Rabba*, the Spirit of God that moved upon the face of the waters (Gn 1²) is said to be the Messiah. None of the passages quoted, however, imply the pre-existence of the Messiah as a divine person.

The references to a suffering Messiah are sometimes explained of the time when He would endure humiliation, being unrecognized, needing to be instructed in the law, and involved in the sufferings of a sinful people. But later interpreters applied them to another inferior Messiah; in addition to the Son of David there will appear a son of Joseph, who will lead back the twelve tribes from their exile, subject them to the Son of David, and so atone for the sin of Jeroboam (*Bab. Sukka*, 52a. See Eisenmenger, *Entdecktes Judenthum*, ii. 720 ff.).

Professor von Orelli closes his interesting and instructive article by summarizing the various rabbinical views in regard to the events which would follow the Messiah's advent. The first resurrection, in which only the righteous have part, is not always distinguished from the second or general resurrection. There is agreement only in the statement that the resurrection of the righteous to an eternal life of bliss will precede the final judgment.

J. G. TASKER.

Handsworth College.

Miscellaneous.

AMONG the minor theological works which have reached us during the last few weeks, there are

two or three which merit more than a passing mention.

Ist die Wahrheit des Christentums zu beweisen? by Professor Eberhard Vischer of Basel (price rs. 6d.), is an extremely attractive presentation of the more modern views as to what constitutes proof of religious truth, views which we usually associate with the name of Ritschl. Specially worth reading are the first twenty pages, in which the author discourses on the venture inseparable from faith, claims that the truth of Christianity is proved when it is shown to be in accord with Reality in the fullest sense of that word, but urges that the evidential facts are perceptible and accessible only to those who believe with all their heart in the ideal ends of life. This is a note frequently heard in recent theology, and Vischer strikes it with great power and skill. We do Christianity injustice, he proceeds, when we take it as denoting all that has ever assumed the Christian name, though this is the definition which has been rashly assumed by most of its foes. Neither must we determine *à priori* that there are documents in which Christianity is to be found authoritatively expressed once for all, for in that case the progress of historical science might prove the death of religion. The better way is to define Christianity as the perfect and unimpeded rule of Jesus Christ in the mind and life of man, and to say that to prove 'Christianity means to prove that the absolute rule of Christ does not bring man into contradiction with the Reality which surrounds him, but rather to the real force which makes that Reality what it should be.'

We are glad to see that Professor Vischer raises a protest against the foolish belittling of knowledge as a factor in religion which is so common in certain quarters just now. In one sense the independence of faith and science is a notorious platitude; in another it is a delusive fallacy, which sounds very queerly from the lips of a scientific theologian, who, if any one, may be supposed to believe that the instinct for knowledge is divine in its origin, and capable of bringing an earnest soul nearer to God. The practical aspects of religion have certainly been too much forgotten, but it is an unhappy thing if the truth required to correct this can only enter the world in the guise of a repellent exaggeration.

Vischer's little work deserves to be read far and wide as a reasonable and engaging statement of the Ritschlian apologetic. Its very brevity is a strong

recommendation. It is in touch with human life from the first page to the last, and has none of the abstract vagueness too often characteristic of books belonging to its class. Perhaps one of its most valuable functions is to suggest that the new apologetic will not be so very different from the old, except that, as men live, they learn to concentrate the issues, and quietly drop what can be dispensed with.

Dr. Rudolph Schultze has written a criticism of Harnack's *What is Christianity?* under the title *Das Bleibende in der Lehre Jesu*. Throughout sixty somewhat dull pages he makes it his aim to convict Harnack of not 'keeping up with the procession' of liberal theologians, and of thus (*mirabile dictu!*) rendering himself liable to the charge of obscurantism. The mode of attack is a familiar one. Harnack, we are told, has not made sufficient allowance for the limitations of Christ's religious knowledge inseparable from his age. In particular, we moderns can no longer accept the eschatology of Jesus, His belief in His own Messiahship, or His claim to work miracles, lest, by doing so, we should forfeit the blessings of enlightened civilization. The old rationalistic distinction is again drawn between historical Christianity and the principles of which it is merely a temporary illustration. In a typical sentence we read that 'the honour and position which Christ claimed for Himself is a relatively unimportant matter.' Enough has been said to indicate the tone of the whole. It may be that the critic has here and there laid his finger on a weak spot, but justice compels us to add that his pages are conspicuously lacking in the religious passion of the book he criticises.

Professor Otto Ritschl publishes a little pamphlet entitled *Wissenschaftliche Ethik und moralische Gesetzgebung*, and informs us that it is a critical preliminary to a larger work. He contends strongly that ethics, as a science, has to do with the forms only, not with the contents, of the moral life; for the latter, *morals* is the proper word. Scientific ethics cannot consistently issue in practical precepts; for precepts, to have any real meaning, must be individual, while it is the very nature of science to be general—a truth which Kant, to his serious loss, ignored. The pamphlet, which is written from a standpoint somewhat unfamiliar, we

should say, to most readers, contains some interesting and valuable matter regarding topics such as the morally permissible, moral education, various types of conscience, and the vital connexion subsisting between religion and morality through faith in ideals. For the full estimation of the critical principles to which we are here introduced, however, we shall have to wait for the larger volume announced in the preface, in which we may hope to find them embodied in a more tangible and apprehensible shape. Professor Ritschl is nothing if not progressive, and every student of theological ethics will greet the future work he has promised us with lively expectations.

Those who wish to read a finely sympathetic exposition of Evangelical Christianity, as it came from the hearts and experience of two classical believers, should make an effort to secure Dr. Paul Feine's *Die Erneuerung des paulinischen Christentums durch Luther* (price 6d.). It extends to thirty pages, and was delivered before the Evangelical Faculty of Vienna in October of last year. It is a masterly and inspiring delineation of the gospel as Paul conceived it, and as Luther drew it in his turn from his greater predecessor. For both, it was their knowledge of the crucified and exalted Christ that killed and made alive, that struck them down in despair, yet lifted them up again to life and hope, and straightway gave them a great free gospel to preach to men. Paul escaped the dangers of moral mysticism by identifying inseparably the risen Christ with the earthly Jesus, and here as elsewhere Luther followed him, to the great blessing of the world. Point by point Feine takes up the cardinal elements in Paulinism—which he analyses with rare enthusiasm and insight—and shows how they rose to life and power again in the passionate thought of Luther. There are differences between the two, of course, but they are such as only to make the fundamental harmony more full and complete; and perhaps the few pages which deal with the Christology of the Apostle and the Reformer are specially worthy of mention in this respect. Other topics touched upon are the doctrine of justification, and the place of good works in the Christian life. It would be difficult to point to any exposition of Pauline Christianity which could at all compare with this in combined brevity, fire, and penetration. It deserves a very wide circulation, for no one can open its pages

without feeling that he is in the grasp of a master both of biblical theology and spiritual truth.

Die Predigt der Sünden-vergebung is a lecture delivered by Lic. W. Kapp at a theological conference in Strasburg, and published by request. The author first of all considers the forgiveness of sins less from the standpoint of experimental piety than from that of the history of religion, and thereafter comes closer to Scripture. Forgiveness may be viewed, he tells us, as a religious incentive, in so far as through it God raises us into gracious fellowship with Himself, and thus awakens hope and faith; or it may be thought of as a moral sedative, comforting and calming those whom evil has caused to stumble and fall. The former is the essentially Christian element in religion; in the teaching of Christ and Paul and Luther it is central. The latter is a more natural and universal element in piety, which never fails to make its appearance when religious and moral development has reached a certain stage. As Christians we have a deeper interest in reconciliation to God than in ethical consolation, for only as pardoned children of the Father are we truly at rest. This is a brief and imperfect synopsis of the conclusions with which the pamphlet ends, but many of Kapp's *obiter dicta*—on the lack of gospel exhilaration in modern preaching, for example—are worth reading and pondering, worth quoting, too, did only space permit. Many, we think, might desiderate a clearer assertion, somewhere in his argument, of the vital connexion between forgiveness and the work of Christ in His life and death.

We have room only to mention a scholarly paper on Luther's attitude to Scripture by Lic. Otto Scheel (*Luther's Stellung zur Heiligen Schrift*). It takes a high place in the growing literature of its subject, and is the fruit of a trained and independent judgment.

H. R. MACKINTOSH.

Aberdeen.

THE question of questions in the Church life of France at the present moment, as in our own, is how to preach and teach the Old Testament. For it cannot be taught as it used to be taught. Two things must be done. Teachers must acquaint themselves with the new knowledge of the Old Testament, and then they must learn to apply it.

Pasteur X. Koenig, Licencié en Théologie, has met both needs. He has published a short account of the Higher Criticism of the Old Testament (*Histoire Sainte d'après les résultats acquis de la Critique Historique*), and a still shorter statement of the way to teach it to children (*De la Sincérité dans l'enseignement de l'Histoire Sainte de l'Ancien Testament aux Enfants*). Both books are all they profess to be (Paris: Fischbacher).

M. l'Abbé E. Jacquier, Professeur d'Écriture Sainte aux Facultés Catholiques de Lyon, is evidently a keen student of the modern criticism of the New Testament. Probably for a Catholic he would himself be called an advanced critic. But the striking thing about his new book (*Histoire des Livres du Nouveau Testament*) is not his own critical position, but his intimate and critical knowledge of New Testament criticism and its writers. To some of our readers he will already be known from his articles in Vigouroux's *Dict. de la Bible*. To others the present volume will be a welcome introduction. It covers the Pauline writings and Hebrews (Paris: Victor Lecoffre; 3 fr. 50 c.).

That great and venerable scholar, Dr. Theodor Zahn, has entered upon a work which is likely to be his last and greatest contribution to Biblical Science. It is nothing less than a commentary on the New Testament. How much of it he intends to write himself we cannot tell. He has written the first volume, an immense volume of 714 pages, dealing with St. Matthew's Gospel. It is in our judgment the best commentary on St. Matthew's Gospel in existence, best textually, best critically, best exegetically, best in the combination of all the qualities that go to make a good commentary. And, besides that, it has appeared at so opportune a time that its good qualities will be able to make their impression. It has seemed of late as if the Church were to lose the use of St. Matthew's Gospel altogether. This commentary will give it back to the Church again, and give it back for ever. We hope on other occasions to deal with certain aspects of the book. At present we do no more than draw attention to it generally (Leipzig: A. Deichert; M.14.50).

Another volume of Dr. Zahn's commentary has just appeared. It covers the Epistles to the Thessalonians. The commentary is written by Lic.

G. Wohlenberg, Pastor in Altona (Leipzig: A. Deichert; M.4.50).

Another volume of the new edition of Meyer has been published. It is the eleventh volume and the seventh edition thereof. Its subject is the Pastoral Epistles (*Die Briefe Pauli an Timotheus und Titus*), and its editor is Dr. Bernhard Weiss. The publishers are Messrs. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht in Göttingen, and it may be had in this country from Mr. F. Bauermeister of Glasgow.

Dr. Georg Hollmann of Halle has published as a contribution to the History of Religion and Civilization, *Urchristentum in Korinth* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs; M.50).

Dr. Paul Feine has written an Introduction to the Epistle to the Romans (*Der Römerbrief*), in which he tests from the internal phenomena of the Epistle itself the theories of Zahn, Spitta, Pfeiderer, B. Weiss, Weizsäcker, and Jülicher; and then gives his own solution of the problem. In a closing chapter he discusses Spitta's partition theory in detail (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. Glasgow: F. Bauermeister; 5s.).

The second issue of Bousset and Gunkel's *Forschungen* is a remarkably able and thorough investigation of the New Testament phrase, 'In the name of Jesus' (*Im Namen Jesu*), by Wilhelm Heitmüller. In Herr Heitmüller's hands the phrase becomes of wide religious and linguistic significance, and he brings to bear upon its elucidation his knowledge of Babylonian, Persian, Mandæan, and other forms of religion and worship, but he does not forget that its chief importance is in the baptismal formula, and gives a valuable account of its history and use there. Yet for all that, the part of the book that seems to us most useful, is the part that explains the value of the phrase in prayer (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht; Glasgow: F. Bauermeister; 9s.).

Professor Dr. Hilty has written four letters. Although addressed apparently to private individuals, they are what would be called in this country 'open' letters. They have also, however, something apostolic about them, not in respect of their length only, but also of the tone of authority that they carry. The first letter is on the Art of

Education. It runs to 180 pages of printing, and the point of it, if we may dare to put its points into a sentence, is that we are making education a science when it ought to be an art. The remaining three, which are shorter, are on Friendship, Dante, How is the Kingdom of God to come? (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs; M.3.).

Herr Heinrich Weinel, Privatdocent in Bonn, is a theologian of the new age. He is keenly alive to the necessity of getting hold of the common people, so that they may no longer be without God and without hope in the world, and he is keenly sensitive to the failure of the Church to get them when it has them not, or hold them when it has. So he would adopt new methods. He would be the leader of a new Reformation. He would not mind how revolutionary his Reformation was. He would insist upon the Church falling into line with science and philosophy. And he firmly believes that whatever the loss might be, the gain would be much more. The loss would only be temporary while the gain would be eternal.

Herr Weinel has suffered for his courage. He has been called Radical and other dreadful names, of which he gives a lively account in a pamphlet entitled *Die Nichtkirchlichen und die freie Theologie* (Tübingen und Leipzig: J. C. B. Mohr; London: Williams & Norgate; 1s. net). But persecution only increases his boldness. He has now written a considerable book, a book of 316 pages 8vo, in which he claims that our Lord is on his side in this battle for freedom of thought, on the side of science and philosophy, and socialism and culture, and everything that belongs to this new Reformation. He calls his book, *Jesus im Neunzehnten Jahrhundert* (J. C. B. Mohr; and Williams & Norgate; 3s.). It is a clever book as well as courageous. In a few forcible pages it describes the critical position of Reimarus, Paulus, Lessing, Strauss, and Bruno Bauer. It then treats with similar rapid effects Renan and other apostles of an ethical religion. It finds something good to say even of

Haeckel and his religious tomfooleries. In short, it is the book of a sincere and not easily daunted religious reformer.

Messrs. J. C. B. Mohr of Tübingen and Leipzig (Williams & Norgate) have published an edition of Augustine's *Enchiridion*, edited by O. Scheel, with a short introduction and valuable indexes (2s. net).

Under the somewhat fanciful title of *Leben und Wahrheit*, Dr. Heinrich Lhotzky has written and published a defence of the spirituality and power of the gospel of Christ against modern scientific and philosophical unbelief (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs). It is the work of a scholar, and is itself so spiritual in tone that we are not surprised that the book should have already reached a second edition.

The theological sea which Harnack's *Essence of Christianity* roused to storm is not even yet at rest. Albrecht Rau has just published a criticism of what is held to be the Essence of Christianity, not only by Harnack but also by Goethe, Strauss, and Feuerbach (Delitzsch: C. A. Walter).

A study of early Christian art, confining itself, however, to representations of Christ and the apostles, has been written by Dr. J. E. Weis-Liebersdorf, and published in Freiburg by Heider, under the title of *Christus und Apostelbilder* (4s.) It is a work which must have involved immense labour; it must have also involved immense expense, for the fifty-four illustrations are works of art as well as science. But there ought to be a sufficient reward for both the labour and the expense; for the book appeals to the general reader, while it may be said to be indispensable to the student of art and the student of ecclesiastical history. Dr. Weis-Liebersdorf is at home in the subject and all its literature. His notes are thoroughly workmanlike. He wastes no words, but he is neither obscure nor disappointing.

The Atonement considered as Forgiveness.

BY THE REV. E. P. BOYS-SMITH, M.A., HORDLE VICARAGE, BROCKENHURST.

THE Atonement may be considered from either of two standpoints,—as a doctrine or as a fact. Of course these are not entirely distinct, much less opposed, for a doctrine is nothing else than an expression to thought of a fact,—an expression which has met with more or less general acceptance. And a fact cannot be comprehended (even if it be apprehended) without some interpretation by the mind, which at once makes it more than a fact, and puts it into its place in philosophy. But the distinction between a doctrine and a fact is none the less a useful one, because it answers to a real difference in the point of view; and there is often more to be gained by taking up another standpoint in thought than by any other course. And there is a further practical advantage. A ‘doctrine’ at once suggests, if it does not imply, an obligation of belief which rests finally upon some moral authority; but a ‘fact’ challenges rational investigation, without in any way restricting the moral and spiritual value of the truth.

Strictly speaking there is no single doctrine of the Atonement; for while several radically different doctrines have been more or less widely held by Christians at different dates and in different places, no one of them has ever come near the standard ‘quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus’ in the Christian community. On the other hand, there is no one point on which Christians, from the apostolic age to our own, have been more invariably agreed than in their belief in the fact of an Atonement: every preacher assumes it, every believer rests upon it, every religious revival witnesses to its reality. Whether the Atonement stands in closest relation to the Incarnation, or to the Death of Christ, or to His Resurrection, may be disputed, but no Christian doubts, or ever has doubted, that it is a fact, and a foundation of hope for us all. Thus the only authoritative doctrine of the Atonement is the broadest and simplest of all, namely, the doctrine of ‘Repentance and Remission of sins, and Life in the Name of Jesus Christ,’ which makes it almost coextensive with the Christian Faith.

There can be no doubt then as to the standpoint which should be taken up in any hopeful

inquiry into the Atonement: it must be considered not as a doctrine but as a fact to begin with. And this is the more needful because of the remarkable way in which this topic has receded in the religious thought and language of the present generation. In our childhood the Atonement held a place in the forefront of the teaching of most Christian preachers: now one may go to church year in and year out in the majority of churches and hardly so much as hear the word once uttered. But while the change is very noticeable, and fully justifies some disquieting reflections, it does not imply nearly so much as appears. The doctrine of the Atonement which was commonly preached fifty years ago is now very generally discredited, having been found both inadequate and out of accord with some of the facts of life and of religion, and for most minds to-day it is simply dead, neither commanding credence nor requiring refutation. But it would be a great mistake to suppose that because for the present generation this doctrine has passed into the limbo of obsolete beliefs no living faith upon the subject remains. The fact of the Atonement survives, and is as surely believed as ever by all who are Christians, only it is less spoken of; and the reason for this is largely that it has found no expression satisfying to this generation. Of course this is far from a desirable state of things; but it is probably a necessary transition from the past to the future, due to the great readjustment of ideas which the recent prosecution of science and history, together with the material progress of the modern world, have conspired to bring about. And we shall serve our own days best, and prove most loyal to our Christian callings, not by seeking to galvanize into a brief and simulated life doctrines once held but since proved wanting, but by looking steadily and with all reverence at the fact of the Atonement, and trying with all frankness to give it an expression to thought which may be true and helpful to ourselves and others who have felt the influence of our times.

To achieve this it is important not to aim at too much at once. For this reason the present paper is limited to the consideration of the fact of Atonement.

ment in relation to Forgiveness. The remission of sins has always been a leading factor in the whole truth of the Atonement, and in this Forgiveness is one of the chief elements. It will be enough in support of this to refer to the parable of the Prodigal Son. That has aptly been called 'the Gospel within the Gospel'; for in a single living picture our Master set forth there the Atonement of God and man under a human figure. And in this repentance is met at once by forgiveness, while the father's love, never estranged, eagerly welcomes home the reckless boy who had wandered off into evil through self-will. In this wonderful picture drawn by the hand of the Lord Himself, it is well worth remarking that the only steps in Atonement which are emphasized are the son's repentance and the father's forgiveness. No conditions are indicated, no means employed, for the restoration of fellowship, no mediator between father and son appears, there is nothing transactional, nothing forced. The young man in his adversity comes to himself, he thinks, and acts upon his thought, and on arrival confesses his wrong; but before he has done so he is forgiven, and taken back with joy to the natural home-life which is pervaded and directed by the father's unalterable love. To argue that because there is nothing here beyond simple repentance on the one hand and forgiveness on the other, therefore this must be a complete account of the Atonement, would of course be quite unwarranted. A figure always fails at some point, or it would be not analogy but identity. So every parable must be interpreted as it is intended, to bring out some salient truth, and not to prevent us from seeing others which may be important also though not there expressed. But that the Lord should have found any figure fit to convey His meaning which did not hint at the points of primary importance is not credible. We are therefore justified in regarding the aspect of Forgiveness as one of the chief aspects of the Atonement.

What then is Forgiveness? 'So far as I have gone in life,' said Robert Louis Stevenson, 'I have never been able to discover what Forgiveness means.' Perhaps most of us will feel more than half inclined to endorse his saying. And yet forgiveness is a constant duty for us all, and (thank God!) a tolerably common experience: we both exercise it ourselves and receive it at the hands of others. Let us clear the ground a little by dis-

tinguishing it from what may be confused with it to begin with.

First, then, forgiveness does not consist in the remission of penalties or the renouncement of reprisals. There are of course many cases in which these are reckoned as forgiveness in current language, but only loosely so. *E.g.* a criminal who has received sentence of death may receive the king's pardon and be set free from motives of policy and leniency alone, as was the case with some of the rebels at the Cape not long ago. Or in a matter of a private injury the man who has suffered may profess to forgive the other because he sees no likelihood of profiting by reprisal, though continuing to nurse hatred in his heart, and ready to welcome any misfortune that may befall his foe. We have no difficulty in seeing that whether the motives which lead to remission of the consequences are themselves good or bad, such remission can never be counted rightly as forgiveness, which is essentially a moral act, not one that is external.

Again, forgiveness does not consist in forgetfulness. We say, 'Forgive *and* forget': for while in practice the two things are connected, and often closely, they are two things, not one; the second being a proper sequel often to the first, and a useful evidence of its reality. But forgiveness may be perfectly genuine where there never is forgetfulness; and in the case of the deepest wrongs forgetfulness becomes impossible. On the other hand, many a minor injury is forgotten which has never been forgiven; and if the frailty of memory were less, we might sometimes stand aghast to find how unforgiving some among us are.

Nor, again, is forgiveness to be confounded with forming an estimate which is not true to fact. If a child deceives you with a lie, perhaps on several occasions, you cannot help seeing that you are dealing with one who is not straightforward in heart. You may genuinely enough forgive, but you cannot think of the child better than he deserves. Your estimate of his character is inevitably lowered; but this only leads you to do all in your power to help him in overcoming a besetting sin, till truth shall make him free of this defect in nature. To induce yourself to hold the child truthful when you find clear evidence that it is not, would be neither kind nor moral; it would be fostering spiritual obliquity in yourself, and would be rather folly than forgiveness.

These false notions of forgiveness must be carefully excluded from our thoughts of the Atonement. However fully God may spare the penalties and consequences of our sins, His forgiveness does not lie in that. He does not always spare them in this world, nor perhaps in the next, even when He has forgiven. And it may well be that He does spare them sometimes when there is no forgiveness. This single consideration is enough to show how inadequate and misleading those doctrines of the Atonement are which emphasize the remission of penalties for us on the ground of their being exacted of Christ. Whether Christ paid a debt of punishment instead of us or not, that does not bring us forgiveness. Nor can we imagine that God forgets the sins that have been done. Forgetfulness is so largely a product of time that it is only by a latitude of speech that we can suppose it in the Eternal, to whom past and present are one. But even if we believe that God so puts our sins behind His back as to forget them utterly, this would only mean that He forgives *and* forgets, not that the forgiveness lies in the forgetting. Moreover God cannot misjudge any man in his favour. God is Light, and the stains and defects which are in us are all naked and laid open before Him, otherwise there would be a measure of darkness in His light. And if we could suppose that such false and favourable estimate were consistent with God's truth, it would not harmonize with His love—

True love works never for the loved one so,
Nor spares skin-surface, smoothening truth away.
Love bids touch truth, endure truth, and embrace
Truth, though embracing truth love crush itself.¹

There is a real peril in this direction in what one sometimes hears put forward on the subject of the Atonement, as if God so looked on us in Christ as to persuade Himself into thinking that we are what we are not, and so into treating us as He would not treat us but for this initial deception of Himself. And a good deal of the teaching that has been, and is popularly given under the name 'imputation of righteousness' falls under the same condemnation. It is just because this last error in connexion with forgiveness, which confounds it with a false estimate of fact, is the one that comes nearest to a true perception of its nature, that it is the most insidious and dangerous of all in connexion with the Atonement.

¹ R. Browning, xii. 171.

Having marked off these mistakes in order to avoid the errors into which they have led many who tried to grasp the truth of the Atonement, we must face more closely the question, 'What *is* Forgiveness?'

In reply, the first thing to be said is that forgiveness is essentially personal. True, we commonly speak of forgiving an act or a fault, but this is not a very exact way of speaking. We always mean that we forgive the act or fault in a person, and without this personal reference the word forgive is quite inappropriate. It is properly the person we forgive, and the secondary object of the verb only defines the point in which he or she requires forgiveness. So we pray, 'Forgive *us* our trespasses, as we have forgiven those that trespass against us.' We must thus be careful, in thinking of the Atonement, to consider God's forgiveness of sinners, not God's forgiveness of sins:—except, of course, so far as the latter expression means (as it does in the creed) God's forgiveness of us sinners in respect of the sins which make us need forgiveness at His hands.

A second point may be gained if we consider who are the persons whom we most readily forgive. Beyond all controversy they are those whom we love. If we want to see forgiveness in full operation in human life, we must not look upon the dealings of strangers with one another, nor watch the mutual attitude of enemies when a truce has been established between them after a quarrel; in such cases real forgiveness is sadly rare. We must look rather at the dealing of parents with their children, where the latter are self-willed and selfish, but are still beloved and are forgiven day by day though still offending; or at friends whose love is deep and genuine notwithstanding the fact that they often provoke each other, and occasionally lapse into a real and galling wrong against the other. It is, of course, where love is strongest that the worst injury can be done. A cruel word spoken in haste, or a want of truth or purity betrayed, does not cut so very deeply if the delinquent be one for whom you care little; but let the same thing be found in one for whom you care more for than any other, and it cuts you to the very quick. Yet it is in the latter case that you are more ready to forgive although more deeply wronged. It is sometimes said that 'love is blind,' but that is never true of true love. One is really far more quick-sighted for the faults and sins in

those one keenly loves, only in their case one is so willing to forgive and love on none the less for seeing the blemishes that appear. And so we must not overlook the fact that the foundation of the Atonement is just this—that God is love. This is itself enough to shut out all doctrines of the Atonement which assume God's estrangement from His sinning children, and pretend that His forgiveness is the re-establishment of love in Him. He forgives because He loves; He does not love because He has forgiven. 'God commendeth His own love towards us in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us.'

But while forgiveness must be personal, and always implies love, it does not mean this alone. What remains to be added? Why faith, *i.e.* trust, and hope. In short, forgiveness implies that you can and do believe in him whom you forgive.

This at once explains its connexion with penitence. You may continue to love one who has wronged you while he is persisting in his wrong, but you cannot quite forgive him till you believe that he is sorry for it, or at least unless you believe all through that he is certain to be sorry presently. Penitence is the promise of a life that leaves the wrong behind; and accepting the promise in advance, you forgive, and wait for the full performance, for which you are ready meantime to trust the penitent, and hope. You may know enough of his character to trust him and already hope even before the first sign of penitence; but even so, you look of course for repentance as one of the first evidences which justify your belief. So repentance and forgiveness are intimately connected even in those cases where the one does not form the condition of the other.

And this also explains why it is those whom we love that we are readiest to forgive; for in these we see clearest whatever good there may be. It may be intermixed with much that is faulty and reprehensible, but while we see the faults we see at all events the good, greater or less, that goes with them, far the most plainly in those we love. And goodness, be it great or small, always has the potentiality of becoming greater than it is. The hopeless man is not the man who in much is bad, but the man who is in nothing good. Let there be some soul of goodness discernible, even though it seems nearly smothered under evil, and hope is possible; we may still say, 'Go, and sin no more.' Whatever the degree of good or evil, however,

whether it be a trifling wrong which calls for pardon, or a dastardly injury which is the outcome of moral disease of old standing, forgiveness always looks to the future rather than the present. You take it on trust that the offender will become better than he has proved. And if in any instance this appears to be impossible,—and happily such instances are rare, while our own fallibility of judgment and limitation of insight may well make us doubt whether we are ever justified in deeming such a case to be before us,—then, though we may restrain our feelings, and avert the natural consequences so far as they are under our control, we cannot really forgive. 'There is a sin unto death. Not concerning this,' wrote the apostle, 'do I say that a man should make request' of God for his brother's life. Where the sin issues in death there is no more room for hope that the man may become a truer man. We have not belief in him to forgive him ourselves, and we are bidden pause, and not plead that God will forgive where He cannot believe in this one who has earned the full and fatal wages of his sin.

These thoughts give us insight into God's forgiveness. For Him time, which for us is broken into past, present, and future, is 'all one act at once.' And so, as Augustine remarked long since, 'He loves us not as we are, but as we are becoming.' It is because He sees in us already what is not yet manifest, but what shall be when we see our Saviour as He is and become like Him, that God can and does believe in us as well as love us, and therefore can and does forgive. To us—creatures of ignorance, creatures of time, as we are—it sounds a paradox to say, 'Whosoever is begotten of God doeth no sin'; but to one who is able to look upon eternal facts undistorted by the refraction which is inevitable to eyes that look through time, this is the simple truth: for whosoever is begotten of God is becoming, if he be not already, sinless; and already his sins are forgiven.

And here we reach at once the limit of what may be said about an act of God's forgiveness, and gain a point of sight from which a vision of the Atonement as a whole breaks into view. Christ came, as He said Himself, that we may have Life; and where Life begets life there is a mystery which we cannot fathom. The creative impulse is His, and not our own. It brings into being in us the promise and potency of a new

life—although we have not already attained—leading God to believe in us, and so winning our forgiveness. He summed it up in a figure when He likened Himself to the vine, of which we are the branches, and charged us ‘Abide in Me, and I in you.’ And ‘whosoever abideth in Him sinneth not,’ but bears the fruits of Life,—becoming not what he is, but even as his Lord is, if He shall be manifested. So all is gathered up in those two words, ‘in Christ’; and who can unfold all their mysterious wealth of infinite meaning? ‘In Christ’ we are at one with God;—that is the great fact of the Atonement. In Christ Himself: not simply in His incarnation, or in His

passion, or in His resurrection. In Christ Himself we are forgiven, and are ‘saved in His Life.’ And so when sin lies heaviest, and we seem to be standing afar off from God, though we may hardly venture to lift up so much as our eyes to Heaven, we may yet smite upon our breast and plead—

Look Father, look on His Anointed Face,
And only look on us as found in Him.

And the answer to such prayer, made by One who knows our necessities before we ask, and our ignorance in asking, is a forgiveness that is already a fact, an Atonement which in Christ is very deed.

The Theology of Auguste Sabatier of Paris.

BY PROFESSOR EUGÈNE MÉNÉGOZ, THE UNIVERSITY OF PARIS.¹

Two great questions engage the attention of every reflecting man, and particularly of every religious thinker: the question concerning *truth*, and the question concerning *salvation*. These two questions are closely allied; they have their spring and *raison d'être* in the two groups of evils under which humanity groans: on the one hand, ignorance and error; on the other, sin and suffering. The uncomfortable sense of ignorance and error awakens the desire for *truth*; while the painful sense of sin and suffering gives birth to the desire for *salvation*. According as the thinker feels the pressure of one or other of these evils to be greater, he will devote himself specially to the solution of the one problem or of the other.

Sabatier was led by his spiritual bent in the first of these directions. He felt keenly the evils caused by ignorance and error, and, without neglecting the question of salvation, he applied himself with passionate and indefatigable ardour to the search for *truth*,—for religious truth in the first place, and then for the historical, psychological, philosophic, and scientific truths that stand related to religion. Profoundly convinced of the unity of true science and of true religious faith, he consecrated all his strength to the reconciliation of

faith and science in theology. His solutions may not be accepted, but one thing is certain, that this reconciliation was the great endeavour of his life.

Christianity is an historical religion. Such is the truth, a commonplace one seemingly, but eminently suggestive in reality, which lies at the base of Sabatier's theology.

Christianity is an *historical religion*. It has therefore the essential characters of *religion* and *history*. As religion, it is divine and eternal; as history, it has elements that are contingent, transitory, and subject to the laws of evolution.

In order, then, to determine what Christianity is, one must make a separation between the religious element and the profane. The very suggestion of such cleavage has been like an arrow entering the joints of tradition, and has drawn down indignant attacks on Sabatier's head. And yet, so soon as we admit that Christianity is an historical religion, the necessity of such a separation follows by the very nature of things.

But it is just the truly historical character of Christianity that is questioned by some; while others deny its supernatural character. Catholicism and orthodox Protestantism err in viewing Christianity, not merely in its essence, but in its entire historical manifestations, and notably its dogmas, as a supernatural, unchangeable fact, free from the contingency that attaches to other facts of history.

¹ Translated by the Rev. J. Dick Fleming, B.D., from the *Revue Chrétienne*, with the authorization of Professor Ménégos.

Rationalism, on the other hand, errs by failing to recognize the supernatural character of the Christian religion, and by seeing in it only a product of human thought and reflection.

Both these errors are vigorously combated by Sabatier. He attacks the fundamental premise of all orthodoxy: the dogma of the infallibility of the Church. In Catholicism this dogma is frankly professed, and has culminated in the dogma of papal infallibility. Sabatier shows how this dogma, quite foreign to the teaching of Jesus Christ, was gradually formed in the Church, and how the Episcopacy, which was at the beginning a simple institution of administrative oversight, ended by absorbing all functions of the Church, and by being officially decreed to be of divine institution. Disciplinary authority was transformed into religious authority. It proclaimed its own infallibility. Henceforward it exercised despotic power over mind and conscience. The dogmas defined by it were absolute truth, the pure and correct doctrine, orthodoxy; he who refused submission to them incurred eternal damnation. Sabatier went back to the origin of the dogmas, and showed their manner of formation, their modifications, their evolution in the course of ages. This demonstration forms one of the most brilliant parts of his work; one may dispute matters of detail, but his thesis itself, of the evolution of dogmas, is one that has been definitely won for theology.

These historical studies have had their counterpart in Protestant Dogmatic. The earlier theologians on our side retained the Catholic notion of orthodoxy, and the unchangeable character of Christian doctrine. Only, after having recognized the error of Episcopal infallibility, they substituted for it the infallibility of the Old and New Testament. This dogma was supported by the dogma of the literal inspiration of the biblical writings. Protestantism had thus, on its own side, an external infallible authority. This Protestant authority, too, was made by Sabatier the subject of historical study, and he arrived at analogous conclusions. The Catholic dogma of the infallibility of the Church lies concealed behind the Protestant dogma of the Bible's infallibility; and behind both lies concealed the same error, that of failing to recognize the historical character of Christianity, and claiming to lift the Church out of the conditions of the spiritual life as it has been created by

God. Modern theology has clearly and irrefutably proved the error of this dogmatic prejudice. The books of the Bible have, like other books, their origin and their history; they have been composed, altered, copied, printed, under the same conditions as profane writings; and, so far as they depend on history, they have followed the laws of evolution. Biblical criticism is not merely a right, it is a duty; for it serves to dissipate errors, and to bring us as near as possible to historical truth.

Here, then, have been equally destroyed, in their claim to infallibility, the two great external authorities: that of the Church, and that of the Bible. 'But what remains after that?' cry timorous souls, who have been reared in spiritual slavery, who feel the imperious need of an external infallible authority, and stand giddy before the abyss that seems to open at their feet. They recoil terrified, and turn back in despair to the old authorities that still offer them a refuge, at the price of the abdication of their personal judgment. They close their eyes, and by a vigorous act of 'autosuggestion' they give themselves the command to believe, be it in the infallibility of the Pope, be it in the infallibility of the Bible. In this way they find an appearance of peace in the arms of the old orthodoxy, Catholic or Protestant. But all minds are not able to take this perilous leap. There are those on whom historical truth exercises such influence as will not permit them to deny it with closed eyes. These men recognize that the infallibility of the Church and of Scripture has been once for all disproved by history. For them, too, the problem thus rises—'What remains?'

To this question two very different replies have been given, which Sabatier equally combats.

1. One is the reply of modified orthodoxy. It is not easy to give a definition of this tendency, which springs from the conflict between traditional dogma and historical studies. It is more a practical than a theoretical tendency; it gropes about without principle or method. Influenced more or less unconsciously by the doctrine of the infallibility of the Bible and of ecclesiastical dogma—though all the while it has lost faith in this infallibility—it endeavours to retain as much as possible of the traditional doctrine, and only sacrifices, silently or explicitly, what appears to be no longer at all defensible. It is eminently individualistic in this sense, that each theologian concedes more or less (according to his own standards

of judgment) to the exigencies of criticism. One rejects the Trinity, another miracles, another the atonement, another the bodily resurrection of Christ, another eternal punishment; this one retains the authenticity of all the books of the biblical canon, while that one abandons two or three or four, or even a greater number. Some imagine that they can substitute the infallibility of Christ for the infallibility of Scripture; not seeing that when they call in question the text of the Gospels, they are at the same time calling in question the data of these writings relative to Christ. In short, one may discover among the upholders of a modified orthodoxy the plainest illogicalities and the whole gamut of heresy. They will permit others to be heterodox, but only to the extent of their own heterodoxy; and they would fain impose upon others authoritatively, in the name of the Church, the remainder of orthodoxy which they themselves have been pleased to retain. They treat as unbelievers those who do not stop at the limit of their own negations. In this way they reveal the working of the old orthodoxy, its authoritative tendency, and its fondness for excommunication.

Others, who are more or less conscious of their illogical position, feel some scruple in retaining the traditional title of orthodoxy, and in order to ease their conscience they endeavour to do away with the historical meaning of the term 'orthodoxy,' and use it in the original meaning of its Greek roots—*ὁρθός* and *δόξα*—'true doctrine.' When we use words in this way, everyone who believes he has the truth will be justified in calling himself orthodox. Others again, regarding this expedient as rather puerile, prefer to substitute the term 'evangelical' for that of orthodox, and thus monopolize a title that belongs to the whole of Protestantism. Such are the petty arts of an empirical theology that is reduced to the last extremity.

Sabatier was too powerful a thinker to content himself with such a theology; he quietly put it aside with a feeling of pity for those who clung to it.

(2) Another theology presented itself: that of rationalism. In this we are brought face to face with a clearly defined principle. Rationalism derives religion from the human reason, instead of deriving it from divine revelation. Its method on that basis is clear—reason being the criterion of

religion, what is conformable to reason is true; what is not, is false. Rational truth is the supreme form of religious truth. At bottom, rationalism turns religion into philosophy.

Sabatier's psychological observation and philosophical study led him clearly to recognize, in the first place, the essentially differing character of religion and philosophy; and, in the next place, the utter insufficiency of philosophy either to deduce from its premises any religious truth whatsoever, or to prove it by way of dialectic argument. He opposed therefore not only the position of pure rationalism, but also the semi-rationalism of scholastic theology ancient and modern, which, having received the revealed truth, believes it may prove it dialectically, and imagines that this demonstration is the task of the dogmatic theologian. No one was less rationalist than Sabatier; he had, in regard to reason in the religious sphere, the same invincible distrust as one finds in our Reformers. In his view the idea of religion was one with the idea of divine revelation. The whole question with him was to determine properly the nature and mode of this revelation.

There are critics to-day of Sabatier's theology, who believe they can discredit it by qualifying it as rationalist. I will not accuse them of bad faith. But either they do not know what rationalism is, or they do not understand the theology of Sabatier; or it may be they have fathomed neither one nor the other.

According to Sabatier, the basis of religion is divine revelation: not an external revelation in the sense of the orthodox theory, but the inward witness of the Spirit of God as immanent in the human spirit. God is everywhere present: He is present in our spirit; His working upon our conscience gives birth to the religious sentiment, and the first manifestation of this sentiment is prayer. That is why Sabatier can say: Religion is prayer. On the front page of his *Esquisse d'une philosophie de la religion*, he inscribed the significant words: '*Quid interius Deo?*' The '*Dieu intérieur*,' as he used to name the immanence of the Spirit of God in the spirit of man, is the living power of religion. In emphasizing thus the inner witness of the Holy Spirit, Sabatier based his theology on the teaching of the prophets, of Jesus Christ, of the apostles, and of the Reformers; he built it upon the rock which neither the waves nor the winds can shake.

The witness that is within is the ultimate ground

of our religious convictions. Yet we control these convictions, we correct them, we round them off and strengthen them, by the help of the witness which the Spirit of God has given, and still gives, in the religious consciousness of our fellow-men. Hence it is our duty to study the manifestations of the Spirit of God in history. In this way we retain the element of truth that lies in the orthodox notion of the Word of God. The same thing holds in religion as in art: the artistic sense produces works of art, and in their turn works of art awaken and nourish, develop and purify the artistic sense. All education is based upon this reciprocal influence.

When man wishes to express in words his religious impressions (which affect the soul in its unity—thought, feeling, and will alike) he employs terms borrowed from concrete, daily life. These terms cannot adequately express the ideas; they are only the garment, the image, the symbol of them. For example, when we say that God is a Father, a Judge, a King, a Rock, a Fortress, we do not say what God is *in Himself*; by such comparisons we only utter in words the impression produced in us by the idea of God, under the influence of the witness of the Holy Spirit. All religious formulas are symbolic formulas; and Dogmatic itself is a great system of symbols. Sabatier attached great importance to this psychological truth. He called it *religious symbolism* when he spoke of the principle, and *critical symbolism* when he had the method in view.

Religious symbols, belonging as they do to the order of things contingent, enter into the movement of history, and are subject to the laws of historical evolution. Hence comes the theory of the evolution of dogmas, of which Sabatier has given such a masterly exposition. This explains, too, the earnest zeal with which he prosecuted historical criticism, and biblical criticism in particular, consecrating to these studies all his talents and learning with a scientific independence that was absolute, and an entire freedom from dogmatic prejudice. In this sphere he maintained the supreme authority of reason. This is not theological rationalism; it is but the legitimate employment of reason in accordance with the will of our Creator.

Applying these principles with rigorous logic, Sabatier emancipated himself from the last traces of the dogmas of Church infallibility, the literal

inspiration of Scripture, and a divinely ordained canon to be accepted by the Christian without examination. He certainly had a firm faith in divine Providence, but not in the restricted Providence which places itself at the service of the doctrinaire theologians, and works only within the limits they are pleased to assign. With the idea of a divinely ordained canon, he associated the idea of a divinely ordained criticism; and thus united science with faith.

From his conception of symbolism there followed for Sabatier a double critical task. On the one hand, he had to set himself to establish, as far as possible, the historical truth, especially as regards the people of Israel, Jesus Christ, and the primitive Church; on the other, having established this truth, he had to endeavour, by means of psychological criticism, to distinguish what in these historical manifestations constitutes the religious truth, the substance of the gospel, from what belongs to the relative, contingent, or variable domain of purely human thought, and depends on the individual capacity, the time, the medium, the temporary circumstance. Sabatier accomplished both tasks with rare power of thought, with the most scrupulous historical straightforwardness, and with the decisive and tactful religious judgment of a man of God and a disciple of Christ. His conclusions may be reduced to these two: he recognised in Jesus Christ, regarded from a religious and moral point of view, *the perfect manifestation of God in man*; and he held that the Gospel of Christ was essentially the proclamation of *salvation by faith, that is, by repentance and heart-surrender to God*, whatever may be our ritual practices or legal works or theological beliefs. In such conclusions we have his reply to the question regarding salvation, so closely allied to the question regarding truth.

It has been one of the great joys of my life to find myself at one with Sabatier in this conception of the two fundamental doctrines of the Christian religion; and this harmony of religious and scientific conviction has contributed in no small degree to seal our friendship.

In his *Esquisse d'une philosophie de la religion*, Sabatier has only touched on the doctrine of salvation by faith independently of beliefs. He devotes more attention to it at the close of the excellent book entitled: *Les religions d'autorité et la religion de l'Esprit*, which he left in manuscript,

and for the publication of which he has given instructions. This book, which he concluded a few days before his last illness, but which he had not time formally to revise, is to be published in the course of a few months. We shall thus have one more jewel in our French theological literature.

Our beloved and great Sabatier is dead; but his thought lives with us more than ever. His theology has its friends and its opponents; it will still be matter for discussion for a long time to come. But its progress is apparent; and I am personally convinced that the future belongs to it.

At the Literary Table.

MR. C. H. KELLY has published at one and the same time two books that go right well together. The one is a thin-paper and abridged edition of *John Wesley's Journal* (2s.). The other is a commentary on the Journal: its title *The Roots of Methodism*, its author W. B. Fitzgerald (2s.). The Commentary is as good reading as the Journal, and there is less of it, though that is of little consequence when the reading is all so good. It was an excellent idea to bind the two volumes alike and publish them together. Buy them together, present them together, read them together: they may well go together and illustrate one another for years to come.

Mr. C. H. Kelly has also now published the second volume of the two-volume popular condensed edition of *The Journal of John Wesley* (3s. 6d.). It is a handsome book; its good round type will please the eyes of the cottager and artisan.

The Temple Bible is now almost finished. Two volumes have to be announced this month—two of the most attractive volumes of the whole series. The Rev. W. B. Stevenson, M.A., edits *Wisdom and the Jewish Apocryphal Writings*, and Professor Sayce edits *Tobit and the Babylonian Apocryphal Writings*. We wish that both writers had been allowed a little more space for their notes. But they have had to fall in line with the idea of the whole series, which is to encourage us to read the books themselves rather than commentaries upon them.

Mr. C. H. Perry has written a volume of *Studies in the Psalms* (Allenson; 2s. 6d. net) as aids to life and devotion. He believes that each of the Psalms is the expression of one thought. As the

heading to each Psalm he expresses that thought in a single word. And his 'Study' consists in bringing that thought out of the Psalm from first to last.

While companies and combinations have in our day been doing their best to translate the Bible into our tongue, one devout and devoted student has worked steadily on into old age, and single-handed has produced a translation that will not suffer by comparison with any other. Just as William Tindale resolved to give the Bible to the people in their own language, so Mr. Ferrar Fenton resolved to give the Bible to the people once again in the language which they now speak. He calls his translation *The Bible in Modern English* (10s.). He has just published the last volume of it, covering the Poetical Books (2s. 6d. net). It is no injustice either to Mr. Fenton or to Tindale to bring their names together. It was long before Tindale's unique service to England and to Christ was recognized; it may be long before men recognize the unique value of Mr. Fenton's translation of the Bible into modern English; but his day will come. Not for public reading just yet, but for private study, for the quickest and easiest way of getting at the meaning of the Bible, this translation will be more and more prized as the years go by. There is no translation of the Bible in English which has so little need of a commentary to explain it. The publishers are Messrs. S. W. Partridge.

Mr. Stockwell is the publisher of many volumes of sermons. He has now begun with the Free Methodist preachers, and has published a volume containing twelve sermons by twelve different preachers, with the portrait of each of the preachers.

It was good to publish the portraits. These earnest faces lead us to look for serious preaching, and not one of them has disappointed us.

In last month's survey of the literature of Comparative Religion we missed an original and somewhat striking book called *Departed Gods*, written by the Rev. J. N. Fradenburgh, the President of North Dakota University, and published by Messrs. Hunt & Eaton, New York (\$1.20). The volume consists of five chapters, devoted severally to the Religion of Greece, the Religion of the Etruscans, the Religion of the Romans, the Religion of the Druids, and the Religion of the Norse. It is a popular book; none will go to it for original research or original opinion. But it is a scholar's book; and it does more for the science of Comparative Religion than many an original investigation; for it does not dispel the mystery that wraps these early religions round; it gives us leave to penetrate the mystery a little, just far enough to make us crave for more. The chapter of most independent interest is the one on the Etruscans.

There was a day when men enjoyed the epithet of Atheist. It might be unsocial, but it carried distinction. Now, none dares to stand naked without God and without hope in the world. All kinds of feeble faiths, or no faith at all, are called by the name of Religion. Mr. George Hamilton Combs has taken advantage of this tendency, and has written a book on Religions that are no religion, calling it *Some Latter-Day Religions* (Revell; 3s. 6d. net). He begins with Æstheticism, and ends with Socialism, taking Otherism, Liberalism, and many more isms by the way. He says that Matthew Arnold is the founder of Æstheticism and Matthew Arnold is the best commentary on its inadequacy as a religion. He agrees with Dr. Watson that Theosophy 'is another contribution to the innocent gaiety of our times,' with a little hesitation as to 'innocent.' 'Otherism' is Mr. Combs' name for Altruism, and he finds that it lives by caricaturing Christianity; he asks to see some of the fruits of its own labours. Altogether he gives the impression of a man who is in the secret of these sham religions and also in the secret of the true.

Universalism or Eternal Punishment—which?

Neither, says 'A Layman.' His book is called *A Via Media between Universalism and Eternal Punishment*. It is published in Dublin (Hodges, Figgis, & Co.); it is an answer to two Dublin clergymen—to the Rev. F. F. Carmichael, LL.D., who wrote 'All men shall at length be saved,' and to the Rev. Phineas Hunt, M.A., who wrote 'Eternal Punishment'; and 'A Layman' is himself of Dublin. Still it is serious, and even convincing. Has 'A Layman' the last word on so controverted a subject? We dare not say that. But he shows with certainty that neither popular universalism nor popular orthodoxy has it.

Miss Evelyn Everett-Green is the readiest of all our ready writers. She sends us a Christmas book through every publisher, and that is not enough for her. Here is one in the autumn. Mr. Andrew Melrose has published it (5s.). The style without and within is just the style we know—handsome gift, and as good as beautiful. Will this delicate light blue stand the autumn sunshine? This year there is little risk.

The 'Endeavour Library' of the Sunday School Union has its character on its face. In the risk we run, and find it so difficult to escape, of giving our children the wrong book, the 'Endeavour Library' is a great relief. The latest volume is entitled *Ralph Sinclair's Atonement*; it is written by Mr. Anthony Sargent (2s.).

The Sins of a Saint is better than its title, though the author has no love for 'Holy Church.' It is a stirring romance of the days of Dunstan, and Dunstan is himself its central figure. The publisher is Messrs. Sonnenschein, the author Mr. J. R. Aitken.

The twenty-third Fernley Lecture was delivered in Penzance on the 31st of July 1903. The lecturer was the Rev. Alexander Sutherland, D.D. The Board of Management did not leave Dr. Sutherland free to choose his own subject, but said the subject should be the work of the Methodist Church in Canada. They knew their man. He accepted the task joyfully. The lecture is published, its title being simply *Methodism in Canada* (Kelly; 4s. 6d.). It is a welcome and pressingly necessary chapter in the history of the Christian Church.

The Protestant Reformation Society has undertaken the publication of a new dictionary, to be called *The Protestant Dictionary*. No portion of the work has yet been published, but a part containing the first three letters of the alphabet has been printed for the use of contributors and reviewers. The editors are the Rev. Charles Neil, M.A., and the Rev. Charles Wright, D.D. And amongst the contributors we notice such well-known and reliable names as those of Mr. Hay Aitken, Mr. Greenup, Professor Hole, Canon Meyrick, Bishop Moule, Professor Orr, and Dean Wace. There is a 'Catholic' dictionary; why not a Protestant dictionary? There need be unscientific bias in neither. In this at least, so far as it goes, we have found nothing offensive. If the same tone and the same scholarship are maintained throughout, the book will be resorted to and found useful by students of the Church, whatever their ecclesiastical colouring may be.

The Society has also sent us copies of some recent pamphlets. Amongst them are the '*Los Von Rom*' Movement, by Dr. Wright; *The Lord's Supper*, by Mr. Neil; *Ritual and Ritualism*, by Canon Meyrick; and *The Interment of Judaism*, by Dean Lefroy.

Pamphlets never do well in this country. Reviewers have no room to notice them; book-buyers have nowhere to put them. Yet there are excellent pamphlets published, and this month there are at least four that strike us as worth very special attention. The first is on *Tree and Pillar Worship*, by the Rev. H. J. Dukinfield Ashley, M.A.; the second is on *The Ethic of Christianity*,

by the Rev. R. W. Corbet, M.A. (Eliot Stock; 6d.); the third is *The Christian Endeavour of the Future*, by the Rev. J. R. Fleming, B.D. (Melrose; 2d. net); the fourth is the smallest of all, and most likely to be lost, but it is the most useful, and has cost the author most. It is a *Syllabus of Lessons for Communicants' Class*, with daily Bible Readings and Prayers. It is published by Messrs. Macniven & Wallace in Edinburgh at one-halfpenny a copy, or twenty-five copies for a shilling. The class is supposed to meet on five successive weeks, and there is a separate subject of study for each week. The subjects are—Sin, Salvation, The Saviour, The Sacraments, The Saints. The Readings seem to be most carefully chosen, and the Prayers, which are entirely in the words of Scripture, are simple and appropriate.

The Decennial Publications of the University of Chicago are in two series. The first series contain two volumes of reports by the President, and eight volumes of Investigations, each volume covering a separate department of study. These volumes are in quarto. From the third volume, which has chiefly to do with the Queen of the Sciences, three papers have been taken and published separately. They are: (1) 'Have we the likeness of Christ?' by Professor Franklin Johnson (50 cents net). (2) 'Practical Theology: a Neglected Field in Theological Education,' by Professor G. Birney Smith (25 cents net). (3) 'The Elements of Chrysostom's Power as a Preacher,' by Professor Galusha Anderson (25 cents net). Each paper is marked by accurate scholarship and the modern tone.

THE DAWN OF EUROPEAN CIVILIZATION. By G. Hartwell Jones (*Kegan Paul*. 12s. net).—This book has come in a very good time. It is an Introduction to the study of European civilization. And in the general feeling after the origin of things, especially of things that touch religion, a feeling that has been rendered keen as well as general through the influence of Evolution, there are many who wish to know where European civilization came from, and what is the character of its earliest indications.

It is an Introduction pure and simple. It takes nothing for granted. It demands no knowledge of

its own subject, and very little knowledge of any other. The chapter on Religion opens with quite a primitive discussion of what the word Religion means. The old derivations are quoted, and the author concludes that *religio* is connected with *relegere* in the sense of anxious and careful pondering.

In this simplicity lies something of the strength of the book. But there is another element of strength. The author has no prepossessions to defend. He tells us that he has studied the subject for many years, that the nucleus of his book indeed was a paper presented to a scientific

society and approved of by Professor Max Müller, who presided. But for all one can see from the book he might have commenced the study yesterday. He is no follower of Frazer or Lang or Hartland. He has no pet theories of his own. If that means less enthusiasm it also means more science; it means a better book as an Introduction pure and simple.

THE JESUITS IN GREAT BRITAIN. By Walter Walsh, F.R.H.S. (*Routledge*. 7s. 6d.).—In the preparation of this history Mr. Walsh went to the original sources, and he used Roman Catholic in preference to Protestant authorities. For he knew that the Jesuits would find his book (they find out everything), and search every sentence of it for contradiction or contempt. Therefore, surprising as his narrative is, there is no doubt that it is true. The most amazing chapters in it are the eighth and ninth, which describe the relations of Charles II. with the Jesuits. Surely Charles II. was the sorriest king that ever sat upon this throne. Was there a sovereign in all the world less worthy of being called sovereign while he lived? Every new item of evidence seems to cast his character in a worse light. Mr. Willcock's history of the Marquis of Argyll showed how shamelessly treacherous he was to the great self-sacrificing Montrose. And now that Mr. Walsh sets forth the story of his dealings with the Jesuits, one's last and deepest wonder is that he had perseverance enough to continue even treachery so long. The Jesuits no doubt made the best of him they could, but their best seems always to be worst for the individual, the Nation, and the Church.

It has been Mr. Walsh's misfortune to have to write the history of movements with which he has no sympathy. In work of that kind a man can never be at his best. Nor can he even show himself in the best light. Mr. Walsh has suffered and will suffer. This is the most hateful thing he has done. But it had to be done by someone, done too with this combination of accuracy and popularity, and he seems to have been the man set apart for it.

BIBLIA CABALISTICA. By the Rev. Walter Begley (*Nutt*. 10s. 6d. net).—There are books which 'no gentleman's library should be without.' This is not one of them; Mr. Begley himself says

so. He says that your library may be quite complete without a copy of *Biblia Cabalistica*. But if you happen to be a bibliophile as well as a gentleman, if you happen to be more interested in books than in reading—well, your library may never be complete, but we shall find Mr. Begley's *Biblia* there.

It is a book-lover's book. It contains very little of the knowledge that passeth away, and still less of the knowledge that remaineth. For whom then is it written, and for what purpose? It is written to reveal some of the curiosities of the mind of men; it is written for the entertainment of those who are curious in these curiosities. It is a *Biblia Cabalistica*.

Now, Mr. Begley knows very well that there are people who are interested in a *Biblia Cabalistica*. He also knows that they will come to his book looking for one thing, and they will find another. They will look for some account of the old Hebrew and Greek Cabala; they will find the newer Christian Cabala, and find it in the Latin tongue. He apologizes for this. He also endeavours to make some amends for it, by printing a few striking specimens of the older Cabala in an appendix.

THE LIFE OF BENVENUTO CELLINI, WRITTEN BY HIMSELF. Translated out of the Italian by Anne Macdonell (*Dent*. 2 vols., 7s. net).—Messrs. Dent are never weary of projecting and publishing new series of books. The very latest series is to be called 'The Temple Autobiographies.' The editor is Mr. W. Macdonald. The shape is long fcap. 8vo; the volumes are gilt topped and flat backed; the paper is soft and white, the printing large and clear; the illustrations are few, but very good. The editor claims originality for the idea. He claims that the difference between biography and autobiography has never before had practical effect given to it. He claims that an autobiography, if it is worth the name, has far more in it than a biography, and will last far longer. And then he issues the autobiography of Benvenuto Cellini, translated out of the Italian by Anne Macdonell, to prove his case.

And he proves it. The book owes everything to its being an autobiography. If it had been a biography it would neither have lived nor deserved to live. It does not deserve to live as an autobiography, but it lives. It lives just because it has

life in it. It has Cellini's own life in it. It lives as a tree lives; not because the trees round about it have life in them, but because it has life in itself. The men and women round Cellini have life enough in them; but his book lives because he has put himself and his own life into it. The autobiography does not even depend on whether the life is turned to good purpose or not; it depends upon its being life.

AN INTRODUCTION TO SYSTEMATIC PHILOSOPHY. By Walter T. Marvin, Ph.D. (*Macmillan*. 12s. 6d. net).—This is no ordinary Introduction. It is no ordinary book. Dr. Marvin, who is Assistant Professor of Philosophy in the Western Reserve University of America, deliberately publishes an Introduction to Philosophy, and deliberately declines to make it an Introduction. We do not mean merely that he takes some knowledge of philosophy for granted. He takes for granted a considerable knowledge of philosophy. But apart altogether from that, he writes his book in such a way that the student of philosophy cannot use it as an Introduction, but, after he has got

some way into philosophy, must turn round upon it, argue with it, contradict it, and then find that, though it did not introduce him to philosophy, it compelled him at least to think. Professor Marvin is much too original to write an Introduction. He is also much too controversial. His chapter on Religion, for example, challenges contradiction at every sentence. What shall we do with this sentence? 'The fundamental axiom or principle of religion declares that *the world is ideal, that the real world and the perfectly ideal world are one and the same*; or again, that *the world as a whole deserves our absolute reverence*.' The italics are Professor Marvin's own. On the next page we read: 'What does atheism mean, and who is the atheist? We reply, Atheism is the denial of ideality as ascribed to the world. He who says that the world is evil, or had better not be, he is an atheist. He makes the world a manifestation of evil. He denies God. In short, *atheism is here synonymous with absolute pessimism*.' Again the italics are Professor Marvin's own. You are challenging and contradicting already. We have only touched the book yet. Read it and learn to think.

THE CAMBRIDGE MODERN HISTORY.

Cambridge University Press, 16s. net.

The volumes of *The Cambridge Modern History* are to be published as they are ready. This is the seventh volume, though it is but the second issue. But if the editors had purposely selected this volume as one of the earliest to be issued, they could not have done more wisely for the popularity of the work. Its subject is 'The United States.' Now the people of the United States are more interested in themselves than in any other nation on the face of the earth, and so this scholarly and sympathetic history of the United States will introduce *The Cambridge Modern History* to American readers, and will very likely secure for it a very large circulation in America.

It is a scholarly history. That goes without saying. It was planned by Lord Acton, the greatest historical scholar, many think, of our time. It is edited by Dr. A. W. Ward, Dr. G. W. Prothero, and Mr. Stanley Leathes—three men who are not only anxious to carry out Lord Acton's far-reaching ideas, but are also fit to do it. And this particular

volume is written by a band of men and women who have made the history of the United States the special study of their life, each of whom has been set to write that part of the history with which he is most familiar.

It is also a sympathetic history. It would not be scholarly if it were not sympathetic, for it is impossible to know any subject until we are in sympathy with it. The late Mr. John G. Nicolay wrote the chapters which describe the Civil War. His sympathy was, of course, with the North, and he writes as an ardent Federal and an enthusiastic friend of Lincoln. But in this book sympathy is not to be allowed to degenerate into partisanship. Such rights as the Confederates have to the impartial judgment of history are freely conceded to them by Mr. Nicolay himself, and more deliberately by the President of Princeton University, Dr. Woodrow Wilson, who describes the events that led up to the war; and by Professor J. C. Schwab of Yale, who writes the important chapter on 'The South during the War.'

The three writers just named are American. So, and rightly so, are most of the writers in the

volume. But the chapters which precede the Declaration of Independence are done by English scholars, amongst whom it is a pleasure to notice Miss Mary Bateson, Lecturer in History at Newnham College. Miss Bateson's subject is 'The French in America,' and there is not a more fascinating chapter in the book.

But the chapter which has cost its writer most is the last. Its title is 'The American Intellect.' The author is Professor Barrett Wendell of Harvard. To pack the American intellect into a single chapter was an undertaking bold enough to

be called audacious. Professor Wendell's method is freely to use the element of surprise. He writes in paradoxes. He says, for example, that America is an older country than England. 'New England,' he says, 'would be better named if, in the course of generations it had come to be called Old.' And he declares that the American Revolution arose more from changes that had taken place in the national temper of England than from changes in America itself. 'In some important respects the New World has not speeded ahead of the Old; it has rather lingered behind it.'

The Songs of the Ascents.

BY THE REV. DAVID SMITH, M.A., TULLIALLAN.

VII.

The Scorning of Sanballat, Tobiah, and Geshem.

Psalm cxxiii.

ONE OF THE ISRAELITES.

1. Unto Thee I lift up mine eyes,
oh Thou that art enthroned in the Heavens!

THE REFRAIN OF HIS COMRADES.

2. Behold, as the eyes of slaves unto the hand of their lord,
as the eyes of a maiden unto the hand of her mistress,
So our eyes are unto Jehovah our God,
until He have pity on us.

CHORUS OF SUPPLICATION.

3. Have pity on us, Jehovah, have pity on us;
for we are exceedingly filled with contempt.
4. Exceedingly filled is our soul
with the mockery of them that are at ease,
with the contempt of the proud.

THE Book of Nehemiah furnishes for this psalm an historical setting so appropriate that one is tempted, even at the risk of being charged with critical dogmatism, to regard it as certainly the true one. When the Israelites had been carried away into captivity, their land was left untenanted; and on their return, they found it occupied by strangers. There were three principal usurpers: the motley tribe of the Samaritans, formed by a mixture of Assyrian colonists with such of the Israelites as had been overlooked in the general deportation and left behind in Palestine; the

Ammonites from the eastern desert; and the Arabians from the South; besides Philistines from Ashdod in the west. It was to a certain extent a safeguard to the Israelites that they returned to their land under the powerful patronage of the king of Babylon. It ensured them against open violence, but not against insult and crafty vexation. It was not to be expected that those lawless usurpers should tamely relinquish their spoils; and at such a distance from the eye of the Great King there was much injury that they could with impunity inflict upon the returning exiles. Their leaders were Sanballat, from the Samaritan city of Beth-horon, Tobiah the Ammonite, and Geshem the Arabian. At first they simply sneered at the Israelites. Weak and defenceless as the latter were, and ill furnished with weapons and tools, it seemed impossible that they should re-establish themselves in the land or rebuild their ruined city. When, under the energetic leadership of Nehemiah, the work of restoration was begun, the scorn of the usurpers was unbounded. 'They laughed us to scorn, and despised us, and said, What is this thing that ye do? Will ye rebel against the king?' (Neh 2¹⁹). The work, however, went on apace; and as the city wall rose from the charred ruins, they began to take alarm. 'Sanballat . . . was wroth, and took great in-

dignation, and mocked the Jews. And he spake before his brethren and the army of Samaria, and said, What do these feeble Jews? Will they fortify themselves? Will they sacrifice? Will they make an end in a day? Will they revive the stones out of the heaps of rubbish, seeing they are burned?' (4^{1, 2}). Tobiah, the Ammonite chieftain, sneered at the idea: 'Even that which they build, if a fox go up, he will break down their stone wall' (4³). Stung by such insults, the proud soul of Nehemiah breaks out indignantly and vindictively: 'Hear, O our God; for we are despised; and turn back their reproach upon their own head, and give them up to spoiling in a land of captivity: and cover not their iniquity, and let not their sin be blotted out from before Thee' (4^{4, 5}).

It is doubtless to this distressing crisis that we owe Ps 123. Alike in it and in the Book of Nehemiah the grievance is not so much violence as insolence. 'Hear, O our God,' says Nehemiah; 'for we are despised.' 'Have pity on us, Jehovah,' says the Psalmist, 'for we are exceedingly filled with contempt.'

The psalm falls into three parts. The first verse is spoken by one of the Israelites, the second verse is the answering refrain of his companions, while the third and fourth verses are a united chorus of supplication from the whole band.

The restored exiles are busy at their weary task of rebuilding the ruined walls of Jerusalem, and the horde of Samaritans, Ammonites, and Arabians, hardly restrained from violence by fear of the king, are standing by and plying them with jeering and ridicule. Response is useless, and the Israelites work on in silence, with burning cheeks and indignant hearts. One of them pauses, and, with clasped hands and upturned face, appeals to God:

Unto Thee I lift up mine eyes,
oh Thou that art enthroned in the Heavens!

His appeal is from human malice to the Divine supremacy. It is like Browning's couplet:

God's in his heaven—
All's right with the world!

Because there is a living God supreme over all, and wiser and mightier than proud and insolent men, this Israelite is sure that behind the humiliations which are crowding upon himself and his

countrymen, is hidden somewhere a sacred Purpose of unimagined good which, in spite of all appearances to the contrary, God is working out for them that trust Him, in His own mysterious yet unerring way.

Faith in God is contagious. Deep down in every heart is a spirit of faith and hope, and it is only necessary that one man should speak out bravely the faith and hope that are in him, and others also will take courage and join in the confession. Scarcely has this Israelite ceased his prayer when his companions take it up. He has said:

Unto Thee I lift up mine eyes,
oh Thou that art enthroned in the Heavens!

and the others chime in:

Behold, as the eyes of slaves unto the hand of their lord,
as the eyes of a maiden unto the hand of her mistress,
So our eyes are unto Jehovah our God,
until He have pity on us.

The figure here is borrowed from one of the saddest institutions of that heathen world whose ways had become familiar to the Israelites during their long sojourn at Babylon. It is notorious how abject was the condition of the slaves of antiquity. There are two passages in Latin literature which aptly illustrate the language of our psalm. One is in the 47th Epistle of Seneca, where, protesting against the inhumanity wherewith slaves were treated, the philosopher says: 'A haughty custom has surrounded the master while he dines with a crowd of standing slaves. . . . The luckless slaves may not move their lips, no, not to speak. Every murmur is checked by the rod, and even accidents are not exempted from scourging—a cough, a sneeze, a sigh; any interruption of the silence is severely punished. All the night they fast and stand mute.' The other passage is one where Tacitus (*Ann.* xiii. 23) speaks of the freedman Pallas, that insolent and wicked favourite of the Emperor Claudius, and brother to Felix, that governor of Judæa who once in his guilty career heard the truth and was compelled to hearken to the accusations of his conscience—on that memorable occasion when St. Paul was summoned before him and 'reasoned of righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come.' Such was the arrogance of Pallas, once a slave himself, that he was wont to signify his pleasure to the slaves of his household by a nod or a

gesture; and if more were needed, he used writing, lest his voice should be degraded by addressing creatures so abject. This is the very picture which our Psalmist paints. He shows us the slaves waiting on their lord with awestruck faces and deferential mien, intent to catch and prompt to obey every indication of his will, be it only a glance or an imperious gesture.

At first sight the figure may appear an extremely unfortunate one. One shudders at the idea of comparing God to a heathen despot. Were the relation of slaves to a cruel and tyrannous master a fit image of our relation to God, what possibility would there be of our loving and trusting Him as our Heavenly Father? Religion would be a sheer terror and distress, and the thought of God a horrid nightmare. That this, however, is by no means the aspect under which God is represented in our psalm, is evident from two considerations. One is that the Psalmist says, '*Jehovah our God*,' and not '*Jehovah our Lord*,' as the exact symmetry of the comparison would require. 'As the eyes of slaves unto the hand of their lord, so our eyes are unto Jehovah *our God*.' To an Hebrew mind, '*Jehovah our God*' would suggest the very reverse of a tyrannical despot. It would combine the ideas of *tenderness* and *strength*. '*Jehovah*' was the sacred covenant-name, the name of the pitiful and gracious One who had pledged Himself to love and guard Israel. And since the Hebrew word for '*God*' meant *the Strong One*, '*our God*' meant the Strong One whose strength is enlisted on our behalf. Therefore when those distressed Israelites compare their attitude towards Jehovah their God to that of slaves with eyes intent on their lord's hand, the ideas of cruelty and tyranny are swallowed up in those of tenderness and strength, and there remain only the thoughts of God's helpfulness and compassion, and His people's absolute and trustful dependence upon Him.

Moreover, God is regarded in our psalm, not as inflicting their distress upon the Israelites and needing to be softened by obsequious service and appeased by abject servility, but, on the contrary as their Saviour to Whom they appeal for deliverance, and look earnestly and trustfully 'until He have pity on them,' until, at the right time when they have got all the good He means for them out

of those painful experiences, He interpose and relieve them.

In the last stanza the whole company join in a chorus of passionate supplication. With emphatic reiteration they take up the closing words of the previous stanza: '*Our eyes are unto Jehovah our God, until He have pity on us.*' '*Have pity on us, Jehovah,*' they cry, '*have pity on us.*' One cannot but reverence the nobility of character which reveals itself in the lines that follow. Distress and suffering they would have in plenty as they toiled with feeble hands at the work of rebuilding the wall, beset and harassed all the while by those insulting chieftains and their lawless followers. Yet it is not their sufferings that they complain of, but only the insults to which they are subjected. '*Exceedingly filled is our soul with mockery and contempt.*' Half a century of servitude might well have crushed out of them both patriotism and self-respect, and they would have deserved compassion more than blame had they tamely and servilely endured those affronts. Their keen and quick resentment of insult and their utter forgetfulness of physical injuries in view of the wounds inflicted on their honour, pathetically yet grandly disclose how unquenchable was their patriotism, and how proudly they realized their royal dignity as the people of God.

As we have seen, the resemblance between our psalm and the Book of Nehemiah is very striking. In one respect, however, the difference is as striking as the resemblance. Nehemiah's prayer breathes a spirit of the fiercest vindictiveness: '*Turn back their reproach upon their own heads, give them up to spoiling in a land of captivity; cover not their iniquity, and let not their sin be blotted out from before Thee.*' Our psalm, on the contrary, is pervaded by an atmosphere of submission and resignation without a breath of vindictiveness or angry passion. And the explanation of the difference is simply that the man who wrote the psalm was one who had learned that grandest, most inspiring, and most consoling lesson which a man can learn—to believe utterly in God. Thoroughly to have learned this lesson is the secret of peace, hope, and courage. The man who with all his heart believes in God, believes also in a divine Plan, unspeakably beautiful and good, which comprehends his whole life down to the minutest detail and most trifling incident,

and which nothing in all the universe, save his own self-willed perversity, is able to alter or defeat. This does not mean that one who believes in God has no troubles. On the contrary, he may have to all appearance more than his own share of troubles. But trust in God has a wondrous power to transfigure and glorify the hard experiences of life. The man who trusts in God recognizes these as the stages, painful but necessary, through which the divine purpose in his life is being wrought out to its grand completion. Did we but comprehend God's Plan in our lives, we would not merely acquiesce in the hard and painful experiences which He appoints us, but would welcome them and would not wish to escape them even if we could. 'I would rather,' says George MacDonald, 'be what God chose to make me, than the most glorious creature that I could think of. To have been thought about—born in God's thoughts—and then made by God, is the dearest, grandest, most precious thing in all thinking.' When God's Plan concerning us is at last complete, we shall then see clearly, as now we can only foresee dimly, if at all, what a lovely and precious use our sorrows have had, how they have been wrought with the joys into the finished fabric of our lives, and how

immensely poorer we would have been had we been spared them.

Let us grasp this inspiring truth, that our lives from first to last have been thought out and planned by Supreme Wisdom and Supreme Love, and that our disappointments, our failures, our sufferings, all that now makes our lives appear so sad, so empty, so purposeless, are needed in order that we may be fit for the ultimate glory which our Heavenly Father has designed for us. It is difficult to believe this, but it is unspeakably worth believing. It is a thousand pities that by our cowardice and unbelief we so often miss the good which God means for us, and instead of growing gentler, stronger, and purer by our hard experiences, are embittered, weakened, and disordered. Let us trust God completely. Let us accept our places in the world, with all their discomforts and disadvantages, as the very places which He has appointed for us, and in which alone we can be fashioned according to His sacred and beautiful Plan. Be sure that, were that Plan revealed, no one of us would exchange his present lot, so painful and so disappointing, for the brightest and fairest that the heart of man could imagine.

The International Critical Commentary on 'Numbers.'¹

BY REV. J. A. SELBIE, D.D., MARYCULTER.

PROFESSOR BUCHANAN GRAY needs no introduction to students of the Old Testament. His admirable work on *Hebrew Proper Names*, and his numerous articles in the *Dictionary of the Bible* and in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*, have thoroughly established his reputation as an exact scholar and an original interpreter of Scripture. We have been awaiting with eager expectation his commentary on Numbers, and we find it to be precisely what we had looked for. Until recently no O.T. commentaries of the slightest scientific value have

been published in this country; and, as far as the Book of Numbers is concerned, Dillmann and Strack are the only two German commentaries that have been available, although Baentsch (in Nowack's *Hdkom.*) and Holzinger (in the *Kurzer Hdcom.*) are expected shortly. Dr. Buchanan Gray has thus required to collect his materials very largely at first-hand. This, however, is precisely the kind of work in which he excels. When we add that Dr. Driver has read the proof-sheets of the book and given the author the benefit of numerous suggestions, it will be felt that nothing more is needed to justify the fullest confidence in the methods pursued and the results reached in the work before us.

¹ *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Numbers.* By G. Buchanan Gray, M.A., D.D., Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Exegesis in Mansfield College, Oxford. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1903. Price 12s.

The Introduction deals with the title of the Book; the scene and period of the incidents it relates; its connexion with the preceding and following Books, etc. After an analysis of the Contents of the Book, we are introduced to a study of the sources. Here, it is needless to say, our author adopts the conclusions to which modern scholarship has assented with practical unanimity. 'Numbers (and more especially that part of it which is contained in 10¹¹⁻²⁵) is, like Genesis and Exodus, mainly derived from two earlier works. These works were (1) a compilation (J E) which was made at the end of the seventh century B.C., and consisted for the most part of extracts from a Judean collection of stories (J) of the ninth century B.C., and a similar collection (E) made in the northern kingdom in the eighth century B.C.; and (2) of a priestly history of sacred institutions (P^g) which was written about 500 B.C. The combined work (J E P^g), or in some cases, perhaps, P^g before it was united with J E, appears to have been gradually but considerably enlarged by accretions (P^x and P^h), chiefly of a legal, but in some cases also of a quasi-historical, character.' In the following paragraphs the extent of these various literary elements in Numbers is briefly considered.—Our author's treatment of the text of the Book will meet with general approval. He can discover 'no apparent justification' for Professor Cheyne's 'assumption of far-reaching corruption of the text and mutilation of (perhaps) the great majority of the names in the Book.' A very large proportion of the conjectural emendations with which the *Ency. Biblica* and *Critica Sacra* have made us familiar, are declared to be 'altogether void of probability,' when 'judged by any hitherto recognized principles of textual criticism.' With this verdict few, we imagine, will have any quarrel.

The next section of the Introduction treats of the historical value of the Book of Numbers. Here Dr. Buchanan Gray is at once cautious and frankly outspoken. He recognizes that the sources of the Book, particularly J E (although even the latter compilation is centuries later than the period described), may quite well preserve reminiscences of actual historical events and conditions. That they do so to a much larger extent than some historical critics are prepared to admit, we have not the smallest doubt. We are quite at one, however, with Dr. Buchanan Gray when he points out that even 'such facts had only too many opportunities

of being distorted, or placed in a wrong light, as the stories were told and retold during the five or six centuries that must have separated J E from Moses.' In any case, the traditions embodied in the Book of Numbers are the earliest that have been preserved by the Hebrews as to the nomadic period of their existence, and it is from these that we must endeavour to reconstruct the picture of the conditions that prevailed prior to the settlement of Israel in Canaan. It is quite possible that a good deal may yet be accomplished in this department by the discovery of fresh materials. Dr. Buchanan Gray wisely, we think, declines to build much upon the allusion to Israel (*Yisraal*) on the stele of Mernptah discovered at Karnak in 1896.

The important question of the place of the Book of Numbers in the history of the Religion of Israel is very judiciously handled. Owing to the composite character of the Book, the religious development is unequal in the different parts. In the early sources we encounter a great warmth and intensity of popular feeling for Jahweh, but the conception of Jahweh is very limited. Far from being the only God that exists, He is simply the God of Israel in the same sense in which Chemosh is the god of Moab. Religious customs and practices bear the same naïve primitive stamp. There are certain passages, too (notably 11¹⁶, 17a, 24b-30 12. 22-24), which contribute materially to our knowledge of the early Hebrew theory of prophecy. A very different conception of Jahweh presents itself in the priestly sections of the Book. Here the prominent thought is that of the Divine holiness or unapproachableness; the spontaneity of the religious life of earlier days is lost.

The Commentary itself follows the plan now familiar to possessors of the series to which it belongs, the text being expounded in larger or smaller groups of verses according to the subject-matter, while special points are dealt with in more detail in smaller type. It is unnecessary to say that as a commentator Dr. Buchanan Gray leaves nothing to be desired. Special interest attaches to the treatment of some points such as Ordeals, Treatment of Hair, Holiness, Defilement by the Dead, etc., on account of the light thrown upon them by the way in which such works as Tylor's *Primitive Culture* and Frazer's *Golden Bough* are utilized. The much controverted question of the Balaam oracles is handled very satisfactorily. Dr.

Buchanan Gray's conclusion is that 'it is probable that the verses contained in 24¹⁸⁻²⁴ were inserted after the completion of J E. But there can be little doubt that the rest of the poems formed an original part of J E. Whether the editor of that work derived them from J or E is less certain: he may have derived some of them from other sources. But, be that as it may, the poems themselves (except 24¹⁸⁻²⁴) are scarcely of later origin than the eighth century B.C.'

We have said enough to indicate the characteristics of this commentary, which worthily sustains the reputation of the 'International' series, and which may be heartily commended to all who wish to learn what the latest scholarship has to say regarding a somewhat neglected and often ill-understood Book of the Old Testament. It will at once take, and will probably long hold, its place as *the* commentary on Numbers for English readers.

Contributions and Comments.

Babylonian Monotheism.

A PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

THE interesting note on the Babel-Bibel controversy in the September number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES gently rallies me on my agreeing with Professor Delitzsch in discovering monotheism in a certain tablet. I think this is due to a little misunderstanding. When I wrote the Introduction to the English edition of *Babel und Bibel* I tried to avoid giving any indication of my own views on the points raised by Professor Delitzsch. But I did venture to characterize the position in which Professor Jensen found himself, with reference to that tablet, as 'humiliating.' It does not follow from anything that I have said that I agreed with either view of the tablet.

What I take to be the progress of the discussion is this. Delitzsch said, after pointing out what he considered evidences of monotheism, 'in spite of all this, and notwithstanding that free and enlightened minds taught openly that Nergal and Nebo, moon-god and sun-god, the thunder-god Ramman, and all other gods were one in Marduk, the god of light, polytheism—gross polytheism—continued throughout three thousand years to be the Babylonian State religion.' Professor Jensen fastened on this sentence, giving it a slight turn. He says, 'free and enlightened spirits, so Delitzsch tells us, taught openly that the Assyrian-Babylonian gods Nergal (who revealed himself in the crescent of the waning moon and in the planet Mars) and Nebo (the god of the planet Mercury), moon-god and sun-god, the thunder-god Ramman (*i.e.* Adad), and all other gods were one in Marduk, the god of

light. This would, of course, be one of the most momentous discoveries that has ever been made in the history of religion, and it is therefore extremely regrettable that Delitzsch conceals from us his authority. Nothing of the kind is to be gathered from the texts to which I have had access—that I think I can confidently affirm. Whence has Delitzsch his knowledge? Will he—no! we can hardly indulge the suspicion—simply have gone too far in this sensational assertion, as others have done in similar cases? If not, we earnestly request him, therefore, as soon as possible, to publish word for word the passage which robs Israel of its greatest glory, in the brilliancy of which it has hitherto shone, that it alone of all nations succeeded in attaining to a pure monotheism.'

Now that was a rash remark. It is Jensen who says that, if the tablet says what Delitzsch quotes, it means monotheism. The tone is that of one who, secure in the completeness of his own knowledge, suggests that no such passage exists, or has at least been misunderstood. Delitzsch gives the reference accordingly in the notes, and takes Jensen at his word. 'Provided Jensen abides by what he has said, Israel is now indeed robbed of this its greatest glory.' Jensen was neatly caught, I think. I hinted therefore that it was dangerous even for one of the foremost of Assyriologists to assume that he knows all that there is behind Professor Delitzsch's assertions. Jensen's further attempts to show that the tablet meant something different from what Delitzsch says, seem to be a last resource, and will surely carry no conviction to anyone. At anyrate, I fancy most will agree with me that

Jensen had got himself into an awkward corner, and that it was a good illustration of the danger of underrating the enemy.

Whether Delitzsch really thinks the tablet by itself proves monotheism is not clear to me. He does think it means that 'free and enlightened minds taught openly' that all gods 'were one in Marduk.' It is clear that Jensen thinks that would mean monotheism. I stated that to my mind Jensen incautiously put himself in a humiliating position. But I did not suppose that it would follow that I thought the tablet taught monotheism. How far the reflexion of Babylonian thinkers had led them on the way to pure monotheism is a subject that requires prolonged study, and the exact shade of equivalence, whether of essential godhead, of attribute, manifestation, personality, or what else, that is involved in the many glosses or explanations given by Babylonians of one god as in some sense the same as another, is not to be stated in a hurry. But taking Delitzsch's rendering of the tablet, I should not say with Jensen that it robbed Israel of its greatest glory. For even if he is right that it would assert monotheism, it would not be a monotheism such as we are used to attribute to Israel. We, at anyrate, lack in it the denial of godhead to all but Marduk. It does not say Ninib is no god, but indeed asserts his godhead, by making him Marduk, anyway. Even if we are willing to grant a sort of monotheism to some in Babylonia, we do not know how far it was held; any more than we are sure that the views of the prophets had any wide vogue in Israel.

Something far more searching than popular lectures and hasty reviews is needed before the question is settled. The amount of material bearing on the question is enormous. We may be grateful that the question has been raised.

C. H. W. JOHNS.

Queen's College, Cambridge.

Christ's Teaching about Divorce.

IN *Die Vier Kanonischen Evangelien*, ii. i. 275, Dr. A. Merx argues for the originality of St. Matthew's account of our Lord's teaching about divorce as compared with that of St. Mark. It is the purpose of this note to show that St. Matthew is certainly dependent upon St. Mark, and that

here, as elsewhere, the Second Gospel proves itself to be historically more accurate than the first.

St. Mark 10²⁻¹² = St. Matthew 19³⁻⁹.

1. The question of the Pharisees seems at first sight more original in St. Matthew. The Jews did not question the legality of divorce, this was legalized by Dt 24¹⁻², but the grounds and causes of a lawful divorce.

But it is not improbable that the question in St. Mark has in view previous utterances of Christ as to the absolute indestructibility of the marriage bond. The Pharisees put their question 'testing Him,' v.², cf. 8¹¹ 12¹⁵, *i.e.* knowing that He would reply in words which would seem to be a criticism of the Mosaic law.

2. It is customary with St. Matthew to avoid putting questions into the mouth of Christ; cf. his omission of Mk 5^{9.20} 6³⁸ 9^{12.16.21.33} 14¹⁴. Again, it is characteristic of this writer to make a refutation of the Pharisees turn upon their own statements. For the λέγουσιν αὐτῷ of v.⁷, cf. 21^{81.41} 22^{21.42}. These two facts explain the rearrangement of St. Mark's narrative in respect of the order of clauses. In St. Mark Christ meets the challenge, 'Is it lawful to divorce a wife?' with a direct reference to the Old Testament, 'What did Moses say?' The Pharisees refer to Deuteronomy, and Christ then makes His position clear. But in St. Matthew Christ first states His own teaching. His criticism of the Law only follows when the Pharisees have pointed out the contrast between His teaching and that of Moses.

3. In other small points St. Matthew's narrative is seen to be secondary as compared with St. Mark's. In v.² he substitutes as usual for St. Mark's historic present *συνπορεύονται* an aorist *ἠκολούθησαν*, and omits as often St. Mark's characteristic *πάντα* in narrative (Mt 8 times, Mk 27). For the addition of πολλοί cf. 4²⁵ 8¹⁻¹⁸ 13² 15²⁰ 19². *ὅχλοι πολλοί* never occurs in St. Mark, who has the plural *ὅχλοι* here only. St. Matthew substitutes *ἐθεράπευσεν* for St. Mark's *ἐδίδασκεν*. This emphasis on healing is found elsewhere in his Gospel, cf. 14¹⁴ *καὶ ἐθεράπευσεν* for St. Mark's *καὶ ἡρέατο διδάσκειν*, 21¹⁴ where St. Mark has no corresponding clause. In v.⁵ St. Matthew adds the clause *καὶ κολληθήσεται ἡ γυναικὶ αὐτοῦ* to make the quotation complete (LXX has *προσκολληθήσεται*). In v.⁶ he transposes St. Mark's *μία σὰρξ* into *σὰρξ μία* in accordance with the quotation. In v.⁷ he has *δοῦναι* for

St. Mark's *γράφαι*. Both words occur in the LXX of Dt 24¹, but the 'giving' made the process complete.

4. What, however, is more important is that the narrative in St. Matthew is so inconsistent that it is clear that this writer has inserted into St. Mark's account matter originally foreign to it. In St. Mark the Pharisees first put their leading question. Christ answers with the expected reference to the test passage of the Law. They state the fact that Moses sanctioned divorce. Christ at once makes His own position clear. The law upon this point was an accommodation to a rude state of society. But a prior and higher law is to be found in the creation narrative, 'Male and female He created them,' Gn 1²⁷ (LXX), *i.e.* God created the two sexes that they might be united in the marriage bond, which ideally therefore is indissoluble. In answer to His disciples Christ particularizes in order to enforce the lesson. A man who puts away his wife and marries another commits adultery. A woman who puts away her husband and marries another commits adultery. Upon this point Christ's teaching passes beyond the ordinary conditions of Jewish society. No woman could divorce her husband by Jewish law. But that is no reason why Christ should not have expressed Himself as St. Mark here describes. There were exceptional cases of divorce by women in Palestine (cf. Salome, *Jos. Ant.* xv. 7. 10), and there is no reason why He should not have been acquainted with the possibility of divorce by women in the West, or why, if He had not this in view, He should not have emphasized the point He was making by stating the impossibility of divorce on either side of the marriage bond.

Compare with this logical and coherent account the narrative of St. Matthew. Since amongst the Jews not divorce but the legal grounds of divorce was the point at issue, St. Matthew makes the Pharisees inquire, not 'is it lawful to put away a wife,' but 'is it lawful to put away a wife on any pretext' (cf. *Jos. Ant.* iv. 8. 23). Christ answers, as in St. Mark, that marriage, from the divine standpoint, is indissoluble. The Pharisees appeal to the Law. In answer we should expect Christ, as in St. Mark, to state the accommodating and secondary character of the legal sanction of divorce, and to reaffirm the sanctity of marriage. But instead, He is represented as affirming that *πορνεία* constitutes an exception. Thus He tacitly takes sides with

the severer Jewish school of interpretation of Dt 24, and acknowledges the permanent validity of that law, thus interpreted in a strict sense, which immediately before He had criticized as an accommodation to a rude state of social life.

This inconsistency shows that St. Mark is here original, and that *κατὰ πᾶσαν αἰτίαν* and *εἰ μὴ ἐπὶ πορνείᾳ* are insertions by St. Matthew into St. Mark's narrative. The question at once arises as to the motives which influenced such amplification. It would be natural to suppose that St. Matthew is doing here what he has elsewhere repeatedly done, *i.e.* inserting into St. Mark other traditional sayings of Christ which concerned the same subject with which St. Mark was dealing. That St. Matthew was acquainted with a saying which made *πορνεία* an exception to the teaching that divorce was inadmissible, is shown by the fact that he records such an utterance in v.³². He has therefore probably inserted *εἰ μὴ ἐπὶ πορνείᾳ* into St. Mark 10¹¹ in view of this traditional saying, and has at the same time prepared the way for it by inserting *κατὰ πᾶσαν αἰτίαν* into St. Mark 10². We are therefore thrown back upon the further question as to the origin of this milder traditional saying. Was it spoken by Christ Himself either in the Sermon on the Mount or on some other occasion, or is it due either to the Jewish Christian element in the Church which found it difficult to reconcile Christ's teaching as recorded by St. Mark with the inspired Law, or to a feeling that divorce for adultery is a necessary accommodation, not only to pre-Christian, but to any known form of human society which is not purely spiritual?

It is perhaps impossible to answer this question with any certainty. But if Christ's teaching be accurately recorded by St. Mark, it seems on the whole unlikely that He should, on any other occasion, have sanctioned an exception to the inviolability of the marriage bond which He there declares to be a departure from the original purpose of God in creation. W. C. ALLEN.

Exeter College, Oxford.

Abraham, the Friend of God.

'AND he was called the friend of God.' For this saying in Ja 2²³ the R.V. with marginal references quotes '2 Ch 20⁷, Is. 41⁸; cf. Wisd 7²⁷.' Here the chief passage is missing,

Gn 18¹⁷. For instead of the words: 'Shall I hide from Abraham that which I do,' the Septuagint reads: Μη κρύψω ἐγὼ ἀπὸ 'Αβραὰμ τοῦ παιδὸς μου, and Philo quotes it once (i. 93, ed Mangey=i. 119, ed. Cohn-Wenland) in this wording; but at another place (i. 401, M=ii. 226 C.-W.) he writes: φίλον τὸ σοφὸν θεῷ μᾶλλον ἢ δοῦλον. παρὸ καὶ σαφῶς ἐπὶ 'Αβραὰμ φάσκει' 'μη ἐπικαλύψω ἐγὼ ἀπὸ 'Αβραὰμ τοῦ φίλου μου.' This passage proves at the same time that 'friend of God' in James is not to be explained as he 'who loved God,' but 'whom God loved,' who is beloved by God. It is interesting that some authorities have in Ja 2²⁸ the very word δοῦλος, which Philo excludes here, cod. 68, the Harclensian version (in the text), in accordance with Septuagint and Peshito of Gn 18¹⁷. Jerome seems to have thought of Gn 22 when he wrote in Judith 8²²: 'Memores esse debent, quomodo pater noster Abraham tentatus est et per multas tribulationes probatus Dei amicus effectus est.' The Greek text has only: Μνήσθητε ὅσα ἐποίησε μετὰ 'Αβραάμ.

EB. NESTLE.

Maulbronn.

A Great Heap of Stones.

IN several passages of Scripture we read of a 'great heap of stones' being piled up over a dead body.¹ The fact seems sufficiently simple and scarcely deserving of further comment; nevertheless certain considerations will tend to show that this simple act had, very likely, a greater significance than appears upon the surface.

The piling up of a heap of stones involves the throwing of each stone separately, and it is just here that the significance of the whole subject comes in. Unless the pile of stones had some special meaning, it is difficult to understand why a memorial-stone should not have been erected instead, that is, when a body was not laid in a rock-hewn tomb.

That which lends additional interest to this subject is the fact that the throwing of stones, and thus raising heaps, has been, and is even at the present day, a custom among widely separated peoples. For example, prior to the year 1823, the body of one who had committed suicide was usually buried in a cross-road with a stake driven

¹ E.g. Jos 7²⁶ 8²⁹, 2 S 18⁷.

through it;² this was, at any rate, done in the British Isles. In some parts of the country, especially in the North of England, in Scotland, and in Wales, when a traveller passed by one of these graves, he would throw a stone on to it, so that in course of time a heap of stones was formed. If asked why he threw a stone, he would most probably answer that it was meant as an expression of horror at the act of the suicide. In Jos 8²⁹ we have the following: '*And the king of Ai he hanged on a tree until the eventide; and at the going down of the sun Joshua commanded, and they took his carcase down from the tree, and cast it at the entering of the gate of the city, and raised thereon a great heap of stones, unto this day.*' The words '*unto this day*' seem to imply that the raising of the heap was a prolonged process, and this is borne out by the fact that the heap was raised at the entering of the gate of the city;³ it was an unusual place, but afforded an opportunity to those passing in and out to throw a stone on to it, with what object will be considered below. It is worthy of note that, as far as the O.T. is concerned, in each case in which this form of burial is mentioned, it is in connexion with one who would have been regarded with horror, viz. the king of Ai (Jos 8²⁹), Achan (Jos 7²⁶), Absalom (2 S 18¹⁷); cf. also the prophecy against Babylon (Is 14¹⁹) and against Jerusalem (Ezek 16⁴⁰). In Syria at the present day a robber is not buried, but his body is left to decay, every passer-by throws a stone on to it.⁴

But the raising up of stone-heaps has often taken place (and is still taking place) at spots where no criminal lay, but where an ordinary grave was; the reason for throwing a stone on to the pile here must, one would suppose, have been different from that which induced the throwing of a stone on to a criminal's grave, or on to the grave of one who for some reason or other was regarded with abhorrence.

But further, stone-heaps are also raised at spots where no dead body at all lies, but which are regarded as notorious; a large number of examples in different parts of the world are gathered by Dr.

² Cf. Is 14¹⁹, Ezk 16⁴⁰.

³ The statement in v.²⁸ that Ai was made a heap for ever, even a desolation, must, in view of v.²⁹, be regarded as a hyperbole; the same is said of Jericho; cf., moreover, Jer 49³.

⁴ Z.D.P.V. vii. p. 102. See also Wellhausen, *Reste*, pp. 180, 212. On the other hand, criminals were also buried in the public burying-places in later times, see Jer 26²³.

Frazer in his *Golden Bough*, iii. 4-12. To refer to but one: in the Melanesian Islands, at the spot where a pathway becomes difficult, whether on account of a rugged ascent or of a dangerous descent, there will be found the familiar heap of stones which every passer-by adds to.

There seems to be a variety of reasons which account for and explain the custom.

1. One reason, already referred to, was no doubt that the thrower did intend his action to denote horror, either at the act of a suicide or at some evil done, such as rebellion in the case of Absalom. It is conceivable that when a man was stoned to death, that the heap then raised was afterwards added to as a kind of continuation of his punishment. The idea of punishment continuing after death is certainly not alien to the Semitic mind; cf. e.g. Elijah's words to Ahab, '*dogs shall lick thy blood,*' and '*I will cut off from Ahab every man child.*'¹

2. Secondly, the action may have been prompted on account of the uncleanness of a corpse, and thus to prevent contamination. The idea was universal among primitive peoples that every dead body was a source of pollution which infected every one who came near it.² In order to be rid of this pollution, a man would gather up, as he conceived, in concrete form, the whole infection of the spot by picking up a stone which belonged to the place, and would throw it on to the centre of impurity, thereby leaving behind him all danger.³

3. Another widely spread primitive belief was that evil spirits haunted the neighbourhood of dead bodies; it is possible that sometimes there may have been the idea of propitiating the evil spirit by casting a stone on to a grave; but in this case the intention must have been that of adding to the memorial raised up over the dead body; the heap of stones, that is to say, was looked upon as the 'house' of the spirit, every addition to which would be regarded with favour by its inhabitant.

4. Closely connected with this is the further idea that honour to the dead man, as distinct from the evil spirit who had taken up his abode on the spot, was intended.

5. That an offering, either to the dead or else to the evil spirit haunting the place, was made sometimes, seems clear from the fact that the

stone which was thrown was, on some occasions, accompanied by gifts of various descriptions, such as wine, or flour, or coins, or part of one's garment.⁴

6. But one other reason for the throwing of stones remains to be noticed. Man in his primitive state neither thinks nor acts logically; he finds it impossible to differentiate between the abstract and the concrete; for him there is no essential difference between them. When, for example, a savage notices that whenever he comes to a certain spot he feels more than usually fatigued, he does not see that the reason for his fatigue lies in the fact that he has been coming up a steep incline, and therefore naturally feels more tired than when walking on level ground; no, he imagines that his fatigue is due to the uncanny nature of the spot in question; either some evil spirit haunts it, or else for some other reason which he does not trouble to inquire into, the particular spot exercises a disagreeable effect upon his body. But whatever the reason may be, he wants to throw off the baneful influence of the place before proceeding on his journey; he therefore picks up a stone near at hand, which is of course within the sphere of the mysterious influence, believing that by coming into contact with his body he is able to transfer to the stone the whole *quantum* of the place's influence that had adhered to him; this stone he now throws away from him on to the pile where many another before him has thrown his stone for a similar reason; he then conceives of himself as having thrown off the disagreeable influence of the spot with which he had been possessed, and is therefore able to hurry off and continue his journey in peace.⁵

Other heaps of stones mentioned in the O.T., e.g. Gn 31^{46 47}, would seem to owe their origin to other reasons; but it is at least possible that the story about the heap called Jegar-sahadutha, was told for ætiological reasons, when one remembers the very wide prevalence of these heaps, and the variety of causes which may have brought them into existence.

W. O. E. OESTERLEY.

London.

⁴ Frazer *op. cit.* iii. p. 12; Wellhausen, *op. cit.* pp. 212, 213; Robertson Smith, *Religion of the Semites*, Lect. ix., and other works.

⁵ Cf. Frazer, *op. cit.*

NOTE.—We regret that in the advertisement of the *Protestant Dictionary* last month several names of well-known English Churchmen were inserted, by a printer's error, in the list of contributors from the sister Church of Ireland.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, St. Cyrus, Montrose.

¹ 1 K 21^{19. 21}.

² Cf. Curtiss, *Primitive Semitic Religion To-day*, p. 200, etc.

³ Cf. Frazer, *op. cit.*

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

AUTHORS do owe something to publishers. They even owe something to their printers. Paper and printing may not make a book, but they may make a book better. *The Note-line in the Hebrew Scriptures, commonly called Pāsēq or Pēsīq*, is not attractive as the title of a book to the mere book-lover. Yet we can imagine the mere book-lover led to buy Dr. Kennedy's book by the beauty of the paper and the printing.

The 'Note-line in the Hebrew Scriptures,'—what is that? It is a thin perpendicular line usually found between two words. What is it for? That is the very question in dispute. Dr. James Kennedy of the New College, Edinburgh, says it is for the purpose of drawing attention to some peculiarity in the text. It is not a Massoretic sign. It was there long before the Massoretes. It was so old when the Massoretes did their work that they did not know the meaning of it. It is an old, old sign belonging to the consonantal text itself. It is the Hebrew way of writing *N.B.*

Dr. Kennedy has made this discovery. Other men have written about Pāsēq or Pēsīq. Within a quarter of a century it has been written upon by the great William Wickes of Oxford, by E. von Ortenberg, by Ed. König, by Felix Perles, and by F. Prätorius. But they have all left Dr. Kennedy to make his discovery. And why not?

It is the patient investigator that makes almost all the discoveries that are made, and there never lived a more patient student of the Hebrew Bible than the Librarian of the New College.

Dr. Kennedy has made this discovery, and he has set it forth with skill. He has set it forth with so much skill that the book on such a technical subject is very pleasant reading. And it is not less profitable. For it renders much assistance to the interpretation of the Old Testament. And more than that, it comes with some assurance to us that the text of the Old Testament is not quite so chaotic as some recent critics have asserted. Long before the days of the Massoretes Hebrew scholars were so careful of the purity and integrity of the text that they inserted this sign whenever there was anything peculiar in the use of the name of God; they inserted it when one word ended and the next began with the same letter, that nobody might drop one letter and change the meaning; they even inserted it between two words or phrases which were identical, that everybody might understand they were repeated on purpose, and say, 'Unclean, unclean!' in Lev 13⁴⁵, or 'Not unto us, O Lord, not unto us' in Ps 115¹.

Among the temptations of this world there is one to which the Assyriologist is peculiarly ex-

posed, and the Assyriologist has not always been able to resist it. It is the temptation to use the imagination a little in order to identify Babylonian texts with biblical incidents. We need not blame the Assyriologist very much. Without its temptations life would be less interesting than it is. Without this special temptation the science of Assyriology would be less popular. All we need insist upon is that we be told when the imagination has been used, and the difference it has made. Sometimes the Assyriologist himself tells us this. Sometimes another Assyriologist comes and tells us, and that is more exciting.

Mr. R. Campbell Thompson, M.A., Assistant in the Department of Egyptian and Assyrian Antiquities in the British Museum, has published the first volume of a translation of certain Babylonian texts. The texts themselves have been already issued by the Trustees of the Museum, under the title of *Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets*. Mr. Thompson's title is more specific. *The Devils and Evil Spirits of Babylonia* is its shortest form (it is vol. xiv. in Luzac's 'Semitic Text and Translation' Series; 15s. net), but its fuller form is 'Babylonian and Assyrian Incantations against the Demons, Ghouls, Vampires, Hobgoblins, Ghosts, and kindred Evil Spirits which attack Mankind.' In this volume Mr. Thompson attacks Professor Sayce and Dr. Pinches for agreeing to say that they have found a Babylonian parallel to the Garden of Eden.

The passage is from one of the best known of Babylonian texts. Professor Sayce has translated it twice, Dr. Pinches once, and Mr. Thompson translates it now. The text is short, and it may be instructive to quote all three translations, choosing Professor Sayce's latest in the Gifford Lectures of 1902.

This is Professor Sayce's translation—

In Eridu a vine grew overshadowing; in a holy place was it brought forth;
its root was of bright lapis, set in the world beneath.

The path of Ea was in Eridu, teeming with fertility.
His seat (there) is the centre of the earth;
his couch is the bed of the primeval mother.
Into the heart of its holy house, which spreads its shade like a forest, hath no man entered.
In its midst is Tammuz,
between the mouths of the rivers on both sides.

This is Dr. Pinches' translation—

Incantation: (In) Eridu a dark vine grew, it was made in a glorious place,
Its appearance (as) lapis-lazuli, planted beside the Abyss,
Which is Ae's path, filling Eridu with fertility.
Its seat is the (central) point of the earth,
Its dwelling is the couch of Nammu.
To the glorious house, which is like a forest, its shadow extends,
No man enters its midst.
In its interior is the Sun-god, and the peerless mother of Tammuz.
Between the mouths of the rivers (which are) on both sides.

And this is Mr. Campbell Thompson's translation—

In Eridu groweth the dark *kiškanû*
That springeth forth in a place undefiled,
Whereof the brilliance is shining lapis
Which reacheth unto Ocean;
From Ea its way in Eridu
Is bountiful in luxuriance,
Where earth is, there is its place,
And the Couch of the Goddess Id its home.
In an undefiled dwelling like a forest grove
Its shade spreadeth abroad, and none may enter in.
In its depths (are) Shamash and Tammuz.
At the confluence of two streams
The gods Ka-Hegal, Shi-dugal, (and) . . . of Eridu
(Have gathered) this *kiškanû*, [and over the man]
Have performed the Incantation of the Deep,
(And) at the head of the wanderer have set (it).

Those are the translations. It is open to anyone to draw conclusions. The conclusions which Dr. Pinches draws are these. Mr. Thompson divides them into *a*, *b*, *c*, and *d* for effective answering. (*a*) Eridu is the Babylonian Garden of Eden, in which there grew a glorious tree, apparently a vine, for the adjective 'dark' may reasonably be referred to its fruit. Strange must

have been its appearance, for it is described as resembling white lapis-lazuli, that is, the beautiful stone of that kind, mottled blue and white. (b) The god Aê and his 'path,' that is, the rivers, filled the place with fertility, and it was the abode of the river-god Nammu, whose streams, the Tigris and Euphrates, flowed on both sides. This strengthens the probability that Eridu was a garden. (c) The sun made the garden fruitful, and the 'peerless mother of Tammuz' added her fructifying showers. (d) To complete the parallel with the biblical Eden, Eridu was represented as a place to which access was forbidden, for 'no man entered its midst,' as in the case of the Garden of Eden after the Fall.

But before attacking these four conclusions Mr. Thompson discusses the meaning of *kiškanû*. Professor Sayce and Dr. Pinches believe that *kiškanû* is the Tree of Life that was in the midst of the Garden. Mr. Thompson does not believe a word of it. For in the text before us the *kiškanû* is not a vine nor any glorious tree. It is a medicinal herb of some sort. The man is sick; the incantation is to recover him; his recovery is to be wrought by the use of this *kiškanû*. What the *kiškanû* is Mr. Thompson is not himself very sure. It grows thickly like a grove near Eridu, in Southern Babylonia; its colours are white, and probably blue and brown. He has consulted Mr. H. H. W. Pearson of the Royal Gardens at Kew, and Mr. Pearson has informed him that it is probably an *astragalus*. The *Astragalus gummifer* yields tragacanth, which possesses emollient and demulcent properties, and was used by the Greek physicians as far back as the fourth and fifth centuries, to allay cough and hoarseness and promote expectoration.

Well then, (a) that Eridu was as the Garden of Eden there is 'absolutely no reason to believe.' There is no reference to a garden in the text, and the probability is that the *kiškanû* was some medicinal shrub which grew wild. (b) A river does not always involve a garden. Moreover, the

rivers here have nothing to do with the River and its Four Heads of Genesis, but is purely symbolical. As for (c) the presence of Tammuz and the Sun-god, either we have here a relic of tree-worship, or else we have no more than the familiar fact, stated in theological language, that the shrub thrives best in sun and rain. The last point (d) is the most important. Dr. Pinches sees in the exclusion from the Babylonian garden a parallel to the exclusion of man from Eden after the Fall. The translation is, 'No man enters its midst'; and Mr. Thompson scarcely alters it, 'None may enter in.' Yet Mr. Thompson denies the parallel. For in the first place Eridu is a city, and it is absurd to say that no man enters into Eridu. The reference must be to the *kiškanû*. The *kiškanû* 'grows like a forest.' 'Either,' says Mr. Thompson, 'by reason of its thick growth or from its thorny character, or both, it is difficult to force a passage through, and no man can push his way into the depths of its thickets except with extreme trouble.'

There is not too much imagination in Mr. Thompson. His conclusion is that none of all the characteristics of the Garden of Eden are found in the Babylonian account of Eridu. There is neither the planting of a garden by a god nor the four-headed river, neither the tree of the knowledge of good and evil nor the tree of life, neither the serpent nor the cherubim and the flaming sword.

Too much Bible-reading has driven some men and more women mad. And although that form of insanity is said to be decreasing, it is possible that our Assyriologists have all been suffering from it. It would have been better for Assyriology, and perhaps better for the Bible, if they had been less expert at finding parallels.

It is in any case highly significant that the author of the first History of the Old Testament to be written in English after the manner of modern scholarship almost ignores the Babylonian tablets. Dr. Henry Preserved Smith is this author.

His *Old Testament History* (T. & T. Clark; 12s.) is the latest issue of 'The International Theological Library.' No one will dare to assert that Dr. Smith does not know what the Assyriologists have been doing. No one will even dare to affirm that the critic in Dr. Smith has been unfair to the Assyriologist. His apparent neglect of the monuments is due to that wider sweep which the eye of the student of Old Testament origins is now compelled to take.

For however close and however convincing may be the parallels between the mythology of Babylon and the religion of Israel, it is no longer possible to separate them from the general field of Comparative Religion. When Dr. Smith seeks to interpret the serpent of the Garden of Eden, he does not look for him in Babylonian texts alone. He seeks him in the wider field of Semitic religion and mythology. And he finds him there, finds him in many guises, yet recognizable in them all. And now, what he has to do with the biblical serpent is to mark his peculiar characteristics.

It is not peculiar to the Bible that the serpent should be more than an animal. To primitive man all animals were something more than animals. They all had something demonic about them. The serpent of Genesis 'is so far simply a *jinnée*, a fairy if you will, possessed of more knowledge than the other animals.' He knows, what the rest of the animals do not know, that by the eating of the forbidden fruit man will be raised towards the life of the gods. But he is a meddler rather than a devil. He has not cunning enough to escape the curse that comes upon him for his meddlesomeness; far less is he the malicious demon of the New Testament or the arch fiend of the Paradise Lost. In all this he does not differ from the serpent of mythology. Where he does differ is in the fact that he also is in the hand of God, who maketh even the mischief of the serpent to praise Him.

We should be wrong if we said that the impre-

catory Psalms were altogether after the mind of Christ. But we should not be right if we said that they were altogether after the mind of Satan. We should be wrong if we said that they were fit for daily use to-day. But we should not be right if we said that they never could have been fit for use.

For if there is a development of revelation in the Bible, there is also a development of the people who are to receive it. For the hardness of their heart Moses gave the Israelites such and such commandments. Moses is not condemned in that. Until their hearts were softer, better commandments were of no use to them. It becomes us therefore (without being condemned as harmonists at all costs) to consider the imprecatory Psalms in the light of their circumstances—in the light of the circumstances of the people who sang them and of the work these people had to do.

That is what Professor John D. Davis does in the *Bible Student* for October. He says that while the occasions for the use of the Imprecatory Psalms grow fewer, a mark of the progress of the doctrine of Christ, even yet circumstances may arise in which they would be the natural and even the appropriate utterance of the Christian spirit.

He quotes from *The Land of the Veda*, a book written by the Rev. William Butler, a Methodist missionary in India at the time of the Mutiny. 'I preached in Nynee Tal (north-east of Delhi in the hills) on Sabbath,' says Mr. Butler. 'Except my wife and another, every lady was in mourning. The enemies of our Lord and Saviour were raging and blaspheming below, thirsting for our blood. The denunciatory Psalms, which in a calm and quiet civilization seem sometimes to read harshly, were in our case so apposite and so consistent that we felt their adaptation and propriety against these enemies of God as though they had been actually composed for our special comfort. We read them with new light, and they drew out our confidence in God.'

He also recalls an incident in the war with gambling in New Jersey. 'The Christian public was thwarted in high places, and sin seemed triumphant. Then recourse was had to united prayer. Meetings were held on a Sabbath afternoon throughout the State for an expression of public opinion and an appeal to God. The late John T. Duffield of Princeton attended the meeting held at the capital of the State. He was asked to lead in prayer. He did so, rising and using the imprecatory petitions of the Psalms. The audience joined in the prayer. They instinctively felt that the imprecatory Psalm was in proper place. The spirit was that of righteous indignation. The desire was the overthrow of wickedness and the triumph of the right. The prayer was believed to be acceptable to the God of truth and righteousness.'

Why was it that St. Paul never had any doubt of the gospel? Men doubt it to-day after all it has done; in his day it had scarcely done anything. Mr. Johnston Ross says it was because he had seen Jesus Christ the Lord.

Mr. G. A. Johnston Ross of Cambridge has been preaching on 'The Spiritual Vision.' His sermon is reported in the *Methodist Times* for 1st October. His text is, 'Have I not seen Jesus Christ the Lord?' (1 Co 9¹). He says that this was not only St. Paul's claim to be an apostle. It was also his reason for never doubting the gospel.

He had seen Jesus Christ the Lord. These are St. Paul's own words. That is his own way of putting the fact on which he staked everything. He had seen Jesus Christ the Lord. Seen him, he meant, with the bodily eye. You may say he was mistaken, but you cannot say he was in doubt. He never did doubt all through his life that he had seen Jesus Christ the Lord with the bodily eye. And yet it was not because he had seen Him with the bodily eye that he believed the gospel and risked everything. It was because the bodily eye

had conveyed an impression down into the soul. It was because, at the time he had seen Jesus Christ the Lord, it had pleased God to reveal His Son *in* him.

That is not an inference from the apostle's words. The apostle himself says so. He says so even in the words he uses here. For it should not be passed over that there is 'seeing' and 'seeing' in the New Testament. Says our Lord, 'A little while and ye shall not see me, and again a little while, and ye shall see me.' Mr. Johnston Ross has noticed that we put the emphasis when we read on the *not* and on the *shall*. We ought to put it on the verb. A little while, says the Master, and ye shall see me no longer, as you and all the world see me now (*θεωρεῖτε*), and again a little while and ye shall see me as the world never can see me (*ὁψεσθε*), with the eye that carries me down into the soul. 'Am I not an apostle too?' demands St. Paul; 'have not I too seen (*έώρακα*) Jesus Christ the Lord?'

We stake the permanence of the gospel upon the empty sepulchre and the resurrection of Christ from the dead. St. Paul did not do that. The resurrection of Christ from the dead is an historical fact. But just because it is an historical fact we should not, indeed we cannot, plant our foot upon it, and say 'I know.' St. Paul had seen the risen Christ. That carried the resurrection from the dead with it. Without the resurrection from the dead there was no Christ to see. But it was more than the resurrection from the dead. It was the risen Christ in moral majesty, judging the moral life of a man and claiming lordship over his moral nature. 'I have *seen*,' he says, 'I have seen Jesus as *Lord*.'

It is there, says Mr. Johnston Ross, that the experience of St. Paul and our experience meet. He had a physical vision, or thought he had. We do not meet him there. But he made no account of the physical vision. What he did make account of was the fact that the physical vision had opened

the gates of his moral life and given Christ entrance. And when the bolts of the door of our soul are withdrawn, let it be by sudden shock as Paul's, or gentle pressure of the truth as Lydia's, and when Christ enters as both the ideal and the realization of moral goodness, we too can say, 'I have seen Christ Jesus the Lord.' If that is the mark of an apostle, we too can claim to be apostles. We do not doubt that it is the mark of acceptance in the Beloved, and we can say, without hesitation, 'I know Him whom I have believed, and am persuaded.'

The question of Subscription is always with us. There are times, however, when it presses more heavily upon us, and such a time is this. One of those 'accidents' that are, we believe, in the hand of God, drew men's attention to the difficulty of belief in the Virgin-birth of our Lord. Men found that they were not at liberty to believe or disbelieve it as they would. It is in the Creed. They had subscribed to it. The question of subscription, the whole question of the obligation of the Creeds, became suddenly urgent.

It was almost inevitable, therefore, that when a new Review appeared there should appear in it an article on 'The Obligation of the Creeds.' The new Review is called the *Independent Review* (Fisher Unwin; 2s. 6d. net). Its attitude is as its name. And that attitude is to be observed in Religion as in Politics. So Dr. Sanday was chosen to write the article on 'The Obligation of the Creeds.' He represents the scholarship of our day in its most advanced and its most convincing form. And he is independent.

No one will read the first number of the *Independent Review* from cover to cover. 'Protection and the Steel Trade' does not appeal to the same mind as 'The Obligation of the Creeds.' But every article will be read by somebody. For it is to be the first demand upon the writers in the *Independent* that they be 'readable' every one. It is on that account also that Dr. Sanday was chosen

for the article on 'The Obligation of the Creeds.' He cannot write an article that has no interest. He cannot write a sentence to which there is no response. If the readers of 'Protection and the Steel Trade' should happen unthinkingly to dip into 'The Obligation of the Creeds,' they would find that the most learned theologian is still a man.

Dr. Sanday says that there are three different attitudes towards the Creeds. One man is content with them. He does not seek to go behind them. They are his standard of theological truth. Another separates himself from the Creeds. He uses them to assist him in the formation of his beliefs, and he recognizes the force of that corporate consent that is in them. He has no desire to see them abolished. But he stands outside of them. His beliefs are his own. It has cost him something to win them. He does not find that they coincide in every respect with the Creeds, and he does not strive to make them coincide. A third feels the Creeds a burden. His beliefs are independent, he feels that they are perhaps antagonistic here and there. The Creeds are purely external, and yet they claim an authority over him. He is 'somewhat impatient of them as representing the element of restriction and constraint.'

The first type is represented by the late Canon Moberly, the third by Dr. Hastings Rashdall. Where is the representative of the type that comes between? Dr. Sanday does not name him.

The late Canon Moberly is the representative of the first type of mind. But Canon Moberly did not shut his eyes and swallow the Creed. Dr. Sanday holds him to have been the greatest English theologian since Butler, the most original theological thinker of our time. It was not the Creeds that Canon Moberly was concerned with. It was *the mind of the Church* as embodied in the Creeds. He had an intense belief in the corporate character of the Church. That was for

him 'a truth primary and essential, a necessary result of the nature of man and of God.' If, then, the Creed comes to him, not as a statement of doctrine, but as the statement of the doctrine of the Church, Dr. Moberly *will* shut his eyes and swallow it. His originality of mind will exercise itself subsequently in discovering and declaring what the Creed means, what is the mind of the Church that it embodies. Here are Canon Moberly's own words, most appositely quoted by Dr. Sanday from his paper on Doctrinal Standards: 'You will observe that, while there is this strong *à priori* presumption in favour of creeds in the abstract as creeds, the authority of any particular creed will vary just in proportion as it can be said with more or less approximation to truth, to be the very form with which the heart of the faith of the Church in all ages and places has been identified, and in which the devotional aspiration and worship of the whole historical Church has expressed itself with most undeviating conviction and joy.'

Professor Sanday does not criticise, and we shall not attempt to criticise, this attitude to the Creeds. Its questionableness is obvious. For what is the Church? It is not the Eastern nor the Western Church, nor is it an imaginative combination of these Churches. To Canon Moberly its only possible unity is a unity of Creed. But that is first to define the Church by means of the Creed, and then to accept the Creed on the authority of the Church. We pass to the second type.

Who is the representative of the second type of mind in its attitude to the Creeds? Dr. Sanday does not say. It is not the ordinary unquestioning Churchman. It is one who is unable to take anything altogether upon trust. He may, he does, arrive at last at a result 'very similar to that which has just been described.' But he does not regard the Church as infallible. He does not take the Creeds on authority. He weighs them; he weighs every clause in them. He is

reluctant to think that the universal belief of so many centuries has been wrong. But is it universal? Is it not rather more or less *consent*? He is a scholar. He seeks to discover the *exact amount of consent* that each of the Creeds and each clause of the Creeds represents. 'He will compare the Nicene Creed in its original form, and in its later form or forms. He will put aside the *Filioque* to be considered by itself. He will compare both forms of the Nicene Creed with other Creeds current in the East. He will take to pieces as it were, the traditional form of what we are accustomed to call the Apostles' Creed. He will distinguish between the oldest form of the Creed and its gradual accretions. He will consider what elements in both the Creeds have been constant and what variable. He will even go back behind the Creeds, and take into account those floating "preachings" (*κηρύγματα*), as Harnack calls them, brief summaries of belief current especially in the second century, *dissecta membra* of Creeds not as yet exactly made, but in the making. All these multitudinous items our scholar will try, as best he can, to put into their place, in order that the argument from consent may take concrete shape, with due discrimination of its various shades and degrees.'

Who is this scholar? Who is the representative of this attitude to the Creeds, 'with due discrimination of its various shades and degrees'? Take these two sentences more: 'For such a one the Creeds will be a great deal more than a string of dry propositions and skeletons of belief unclothed with flesh and blood. They will be what, I think, Tertullian called his creed, *contesseratio*, "the password of brotherhood," the password by which a Christian is known to his fellows, the countersign that he gives when he is challenged.' We pass to the third type.

The representative of the third type is Dr. Rashdall. The expression of Dr. Rashdall's mind on the subject is to be found in the *International Journal of Ethics* for 1897, in an article on 'The

Ethics of Religious Conformity.' The third type does not much consider the place of the Creeds in the history or devotion of the Church; it does not consider their value as the countersign of Christian brotherhood; it concentrates attention upon them as 'the test required by law of English Churchmanship.'

Dr. Sanday takes Dr. Rashdall as the representative of this type. He associates with him for a moment Canon Hensley Henson. And he is glad that he has two such representatives to produce. They are both so outspoken. They do not believe in the Creeds, and they say so. They have subscribed to them in a non-natural sense, and they say that they have. They do not take the words of the Creeds (that is to say, certain words round which modern objections gather), in the sense in which these words are ordinarily understood, and they say that they do not.

Dr. Sanday likes this candour. What he thinks of their way with the Creeds he will say in a moment. At present he says that he likes the candid confessions that they make of their way with them. His only fault with them is that they are too candid, especially Dr. Rashdall. Dr. Rashdall repeatedly applies the words 'untruth' and 'disbelief' to his own conduct and his own attitude toward the Creeds. Now this is all very well as candour; but what if it contains a subtle suggestion that the opponent in argument is equally unbelieving and untrue but less candid? What, too, if it not only makes sport for the Philistines, but misses the exact shade of a rather delicate truth? 'It is all very well,' says Dr. Sanday, 'to call a spade a spade, but it would disturb the look of the page—and perhaps something more than the look of the page—to insist on spelling the word, every time it occurs, in capital letters.'

Dr. Rashdall's argument—to put it much more bluntly because more briefly than Dr. Sanday puts

it—is that every man should interpret the Creeds, or any article in them that offends him, in his own way. Let him also say so. The world may be shocked, but it is better that the world should be shocked in that manner than that the Church should lose the use of the very men who are able to free her from the shackles of Creed subscription. Dr. Sanday answers that in all this he hears Dr. Rashdall the liberal theologian. He wonders what Dr. Rashdall the moral philosopher will say. 'I should like to be instructed by the two Rashdalls, the Churchman and the philosopher, when they have come to terms between themselves.'

Thus Dr. Sanday's arguments are with Canon Moberly, not with Dr. Rashdall. Where is Dr. Sanday himself? Dr. Sanday is after all and almost altogether on Dr. Rashdall's side. For he appreciates, as Canon Moberly was unable to appreciate, the rights of the individual Churchman's intellect. He appreciates, as Canon Moberly was unable to appreciate, the progress of human thought. 'The thought of the twentieth century'—his words are very strong—'*cannot be identical with the thought of the second or fourth.*' He therefore sees and frankly acknowledges that 'some mitigation to the strictness of subscription, even to the Creeds, is not only desirable but inevitable.'

How is mitigation to come? One way, he says, is by having regard to the scriptural meaning of the words of the Creed, or of some particular clause in the Creed, and by accepting the words in that sense, not in the sense in which the framers of the Creed understood them. He considers it quite legitimate for a man who knows all that the clause, 'He descended into hell,' or the clause, 'I believe in the resurrection of the body,' properly means, to accept these clauses in that proper meaning.

This principle, he believes, would cover all the difficulties that are felt as to what is called the Athanasian Creed. And he gives his own

experience: 'Many years ago, when I first began clerical life, I joined in a memorial asking for relief from the use of this Creed; but now I value it greatly. The principal reason for this change of front has been a more thorough study of the patristic writings concerned with the prolonged and searching controversy of which this Creed is at once the climax and, in the Western Church, the close.'

No doubt there are 'damnatory clauses' in the Athanasian Creed. And Dr. Sanday knows that the modern mind shrinks from what seems to be a sweeping condemnation of its fellow-men. He does not doubt that this shrinking is just. But wrongness of belief is not to be dismissed as an unimportant thing. In proportion to the blessedness of right belief must be the loss of wrong belief. And for the rest it is well to let the modern mind emphasize the positive, and skip somewhat lightly over the negative side of these disturbing clauses.

But there is another principle whereby the rigour of subscription may be mitigated. The Creeds belong to the Church, not to the individual. Properly they are the expression of the faith of the corporate body. Their use is in public worship. And when the individual joins in reciting them he does so, not as an individual but as a member of the corporate body. It is true that in the Nicene Creed the Western Church has taught us to say, 'I believe.' But this is a Western modification. **A**t the Eastern Creeds generally, and even in the Athanasian Creed in its older Latin translations, the individual is 'we believe.'

The question then is this. How much does the 'we' of the Creeds demand of the individual? How much does it demand of a scholar who knows their history and the process of their formation? Dr. Sanday answers by an example.

His example is the clause in the Creed that affirms the Virgin-birth. Now Dr. Sanday will not admit that the evidence for the Virgin-birth is really 'slight.' It is small enough in amount. But objective truth of fact is not always in proportion to the amount or even the conclusiveness of evidence. In this case the loss of a particular branch of literature might account for the paucity of the evidence. A chance discovery might at any moment make it more. Moreover, you cannot isolate the Virgin-birth and deal with it out of all relation to the doctrine of the Incarnation and its own historical place in the Christian religion. Yet Dr. Sanday deliberately says: 'I do not think that we can prevent, or that it would be right to attempt to prevent, a competent scholar from forming his own estimate of the evidence (in the narrower sense) for the Virgin-birth.' And when Canon Hensley Henson complains that the Bishops of Norwich and of Bristol demand from candidates for ordination express and separate subscription to this article of the Creed, he does not approve. 'We do not want,' he says, 'to induce our young men to commit themselves to more than their knowledge or clearness of head would perhaps justify them in committing themselves to. The total effect is the important thing. Let it suffice that by subscribing to the Creed as a whole, the man declares himself heart and soul a Christian.'

Christ the Wisdom of God.¹

BY THE REV. H. B. SWETE, D.D., LITT.D., REGIUS PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY, CAMBRIDGE.

'We preach Christ . . . the Wisdom of God.'—

1 Cor. i. 23, 24.

'That they may know the Mystery of God, even Christ, in whom are all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge hidden.'—Col. ii. 2, 3.

THERE is a subtle difference between these texts, due to a difference in the local conditions of the Churches addressed.

Corinth, in St. Paul's time, was chiefly remarkable as a great centre of commerce. The bulk of its population was immersed in business or in the pleasures which attend upon wealth. Yet as a Greek city and a near neighbour of Athens, Corinth could not be indifferent to the claims of philosophy. 'The Greeks seek after wisdom,' and here, as elsewhere throughout Hellas, the cultured and thoughtful class devoted its leisure to the studies of the schools. Thus, as soon as Christianity at Corinth had outgrown the synagogue, it was confronted with philosophy; and philosophy, regarding the new faith as the cult of a crucified Jew, turned from it as folly. But St. Paul was neither discouraged nor abashed. The foolishness of God, he is bold to answer, is wiser than men, and Christ crucified is not the foolishness of God but His Wisdom. The Gospel is the Divine philosophy.

At Colossæ, also, Christianity encountered philosophy, but in another form. This Phrygian town was inhabited by a mixed population of Greek settlers and the native race, a race whose blood was hot with the temper of religious fanaticism. Moreover, it lay on the great trade route which brought the treasures and the ideas of the East from the Euphrates to the coast of the Ægean. At Colossæ, as in other Greek towns, men spent their time in intellectual speculation, but their inquiries were not limited to physics and metaphysics, politics and ethics; they ventured into the secrets of the spiritual world, boasted of visions and revelations, filled the distance between God and the creature with hosts of imaginary existences in whose agency they sought a key to the mysteries of creation. This Colossian theosophy would

have made terms with Christianity. But St. Paul met it, as he met the Greek wisdom, by preaching Christ in His relation to the intellectual problems of life. Did they desire to probe the secrets of nature? Christ is the Mystery, the Secret, of God, laid open to those who believe. Were they in search of new treasures of wisdom and knowledge, of speculative thought and intuitive apprehension? All were in Christ, hidden from the world, but to be found by those who would seek them in Him.

Thus, for theosophy at Colossæ, as for philosophy at Corinth, the apostle found a sufficient answer. And his answer to both was CHRIST. In Christ, he would say, there is satisfaction for all the intellectual and spiritual needs of men. He is not only the Redeemer and the Saviour, but the Teacher and Guide of men. He is made unto us not only Righteousness and Sanctification and Redemption, but Wisdom also; He is the Wisdom, the Mystery of God. Thus at its very outset, by the pen of St. Paul, the gospel claimed to contain within itself latent powers by which, as the world went on, it would fulfil all the legitimate expectations of those who came to it for light and truth, as well as for healing and strength.

Our own age presents to the preachers of the faith problems far removed from those which met St. Paul either at Corinth or at Colossæ. Philosophy does not to-day scoff at the Cross, nor if theosophy still finds votaries amongst us, does it seriously threaten our common Christianity. But the time is one of manifold intellectual activity, and it is not at all disposed to let the truth go unchallenged. Scientific discovery on the one hand and historical research upon the other are raising questions which demand an answer, and which cannot be answered by mere assertion. Men are waiting to see whether the Christianity of the Creeds and of the Church will succeed in making good its claim, or whether it will go under, as other systems have gone, and dwindle into a

¹ A sermon preached in the chapel of Selwyn College, at the opening service of the Clergy Summer Meeting (13th July 1903).

popular superstition. It is natural that they should look to us of the clergy in the first instance. We are the appointed interpreters of the gospel to our own age, and our interpretation will be the criterion by which Christianity will commonly be judged. In what I have to say now I am anxious to consider two or three points which come into sight when we ask ourselves how, as Christian teachers, we ought to deal with the situation created by the intellectual progress of the time.

In the first place there can be no question amongst us of any surrender of the faith once for all delivered to the saints. It would be easy to purchase immunity from hostile criticism by sacrificing one after another of the articles of the Christian Creed. It would have been easy for St. Paul to gain the wise by ceasing to preach the Cross. The Cross alienated both Jews and Greeks; to the one it was a stumbling-block, to the other an absurdity. But he preached it nevertheless, and the Cross triumphed. The Cross is not now an offence to thoughtful men; the suffering Christ appeals to a world which has learned by centuries of Christian teaching and experience the sacredness of sorrow and the mystery of pain. But there are other Christian doctrines to which the age demurs: the Virgin-birth of our Lord, His literal Resurrection from the dead, His essential Oneness with the Father. Here our stand must be made to-day; as St. Paul preached Christ crucified in the face of Greek philosophy, so it is for us to preach the Incarnation and Resurrection, whether educated opinion is with us or against us, never doubting that the future is with us in any case: *magna est veritas, et prævalet*.

In matters of faith there can be no compromise. We have been entrusted with a precious deposit of truth, which it is ours to hand on undiminished to generations to come. Yet our trust is not to be kept after the manner of the slothful servant who laid his lord's pound up in a napkin. It is to be traded with that it may be increased, and the Lord may at His coming receive His own with interest. The parable has many applications, and I venture to think that not the least important is that which touches us as Christian teachers. Wrapt up in set words and phrases, true and precise, but carrying little light or help to the mind, the doctrines of Christianity are as buried treasure which yields no increase. To reiterate truths in soulless

platitudes, to rehearse forms of belief which arose out of the needs of a long buried age, to preach the Creed of the fourth century without reference to the thought and life of the twentieth, this is not to be faithful to our trust, as our Master counts faithfulness. We have to convert our deposit into the words and ideas of the time, that we may make it more. We have to show the relation of the truths we teach to the life of man and to the scheme of things as we find them in the world. We have to demonstrate that Christ, as He is depicted in the Creeds, is the Wisdom of God.

Let me take by way of example the great doctrine of the Incarnation. It is the fashion to represent the Nicene settlement as an interpretation of the gospel which the world has outlived and will never again accept. In the few precise words of the Creed it sounds to many modern ears like an echo of an exploded philosophy. How deeply it enters into the experience of life, how great a need of humanity it alone can fill, to how many intellectual problems it supplies the only key, is far from the thoughts of those who offer this cheap criticism. Yet all this was clearly seen from the first by the chief actor in the drama of the Nicene age. *Athanasius contra mundum* is a commonplace, but few of those who use it know why Athanasius made that lifelong stand for the Homoousion. It was not dogged obstinacy that impelled him, but the deepest sense of the vital issues involved. We have but to read his youthful treatise on the Incarnation to convince us of this: He saw from the very first that the Incarnation as the Church taught it was the true basis for any real philosophy of life. He realized that life is healthy, strong, fruitful, hopeful, in proportion as men believe that the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us, and that this Incarnate Word is God of God, the Eternal Son. It was not for words or names that he fought his lifelong battle, but for truth, and a truth which he knew to be the very keystone of the arch. There is in his early work, written before the great controversy had begun, a sweet reasonableness, a large outlook on life, a sense of the proportion of things, which wins the reader's general assent; even when the arguments are foreign to his own point of view. The book is, to my mind, the key to Athanasius' whole course; and it is by such methods and in the strength of such a conviction that I look to see the truth of the Incarnation asserted against the

doubts of our own time. It is a happy augury that we have in this Church of England men who have taken up the defence of the faith in the true spirit of Alexandrian Christianity, meeting the wisdom of men with the Wisdom of God. I need but refer to the writings of Bishop Gore and Mr. Illingworth to explain what I mean.

Let me refer for a few moments to another question of much importance to Christian teachers upon which our age has much to say. Beyond a doubt the vantage ground long occupied in the public estimation by the Bible as an inspired book has been seriously menaced. The attack has come from several quarters; from physical science, from archaeology, from literary criticism. There have been and there are great searchings of heart amongst ourselves as to the literary problems raised by a critical examination of the Old Testament, whilst quite recently Germany has been thrown into a ferment by the popular lecture of an Assyriologist. The New Testament seemed to have passed out of the stormy waters of the nineteenth century, but we are beginning to discover that the storm was only turned aside and not stilled by the work of the great Christian scholars of the last generation. There has been, no doubt, in some recent publications a great deal of crude, rash criticism with which the Church need not seriously reckon; but we cannot ignore the tendency of all this to weaken the hold of educated men with no special theological knowledge upon the primary documents of our faith.

Now, this question of the Inspiration of Scripture stands, if we consider, upon a somewhat different plane from that of a great doctrine such as the Incarnation. For while Scripture does undoubtedly claim inspiration, and it is an article of the Catholic Faith that the Holy Ghost spake by the prophets, the nature and extent of this action is not defined. It is therefore conceivable that with increasing knowledge fresh light may be thrown, not only on the purpose of inspiration, but on its character. Provided that the fact of Revelation is not denied, provided that the Bible is admitted to contain, above all other writings, a progressive teaching of spiritual truth, given by inspiration of God, we can listen with respect to all that science, archæology, or literary criticism may have to say upon the question. If the early narration of Genesis are found to be echoes of old Semitic folklore, of which there are earlier versions in the newly-recovered libraries

of Babylonia, if even the religion of Israel strikes its roots into Babylonian ground, the discovery does not abate the force of *one* of the spiritual teachings of the Hebrew book, or lessen our conviction that the God of all the nations of the earth specially revealed Himself to the forefathers of the Jew. Nor will our faith in the Incarnation be weakened by any conceivable solution of the Synoptic problem, or any view of the authorship of the Fourth Gospel; or our belief in the doctrine of Justification by Faith be endangered by a negative answer to the question, 'Did Paul write Romans?'

Many of us have doubtless arrived at this conclusion, and some have felt profoundly thankful that they have been able to part with that too rigid conception of inspiration which has long hindered the intelligent use of God's great gift of the Bible. But we have still to face the serious question how popular opinion on the subject may be so guided, that with the entrance of the new view there may not come a loss of the old spirit of reverence and trust. The public mind is apt to pass from one extreme to another, and will need much wise and tactful guidance during the period of transition. There are clearly two things to be feared. There is, on the one hand, the danger that if the clergy do not take the lead, many upon whom the truth breaks suddenly will, in the first impulse of surprise, cast away their belief in the Bible as a true Revelation; and, on the other hand, there is the risk that by introducing questions of this kind into their public teaching, preachers may perplex and distress simple souls to whom the possession of an infallible Book is a necessary condition of Christian faith. I rejoice that this difficult problem is to be made the subject of a conference during the present meeting, and trust that some wise course may be suggested as the result of our deliberations upon it.

There is a larger question which cannot be discussed, but may just be touched upon. What is the right attitude of the clergy towards that great growth of physical science which, within the memories of many among us, has revolutionized modern life? Although we are sometimes told that the conflict between Science and Religion has ceased or is ceasing, I fear we must not hide from ourselves that, on the whole, scientific opinion is hostile still; of open hostility there may be little, but this means that the subject is avoided as one

on which there is no use in saying more at present, and not that any real concordat has been established. But I am not sure that the blame of any soreness that may be felt on the side of science lies wholly at the door of scientific men; there has been in the past at least a disposition on our side to misunderstand and perhaps quite unconsciously to misrepresent their position, or at any rate an absence of any serious endeavour to sympathize with what may be good and true in it. I cannot but notice that St. Paul went as far as he could to put himself in line with the philosophers of Corinth and the theosophists at Colossæ, representing Christ to the one as the Wisdom, and to the other as the Mystery of God. To seek for wisdom, to be attracted by mystery, was in itself no bad thing; only there was a higher, diviner wisdom, a greater, truer mystery than they knew. And if the apostle felt this measure of sympathy with the speculative wisdom of Greek philosophy and the 'vain deceit' of Colossian angelology, how much nearer would he have been drawn to studies which have for their object the interrogation of God's handiwork in Nature with the view of eliciting results serviceable to mankind? He would have seen in them, I do not doubt, an ultimate ally of the gospel; he would have said to himself in effect, 'This great advance in physical knowledge which is going forward is part of the large movement by which the treasures of Christ are being revealed. The secrets which Nature is yielding up to Science are fragments of His Secret; the natural laws which are being disclosed are among the conditions upon which all things consist in Him or are by Him carried to their goal; the mysterious powers which, latent in matter from the first, are now at length being educed from it for the service of man, were implanted in it at the beginning by that Eternal Word without Whom nothing was made.' So, I do not doubt, St. Paul would have said, had he been in our position; indeed, he has in no small manner anticipated what the present situation demands in the opening sentences of his Epistles to the Ephesians and the Colossians. And St. John, the other great theologian of the New Testament, would have concurred with St. Paul, and does in fact, in his prologue, practically dictate the attitude of the Church towards all honest work done in the domain of physical research. The theologian is the last man in the world who should lift a finger

to check the progress of knowledge such as this. Believing as he does that all Nature is Christ's handiwork, and that He by whom all things were made is immanent in the creation, so that every new discovery is but a fresh light thrown upon the hidden treasures of His creative wisdom, the Christian teacher knows that true science is the friend and not the foe of his faith, and will some day cast its crown at the feet of his King. It may be difficult to realize this when for the moment miracles are denounced as unhistorical, and young men come to us with the sad tale of faith shattered and hope destroyed by their first year's work in our laboratories and museums. But as for the miracles, there are already symptoms of a recovery of faith in that direction: it is conceded that the power of personality and will over certain forms of disease is apparently unlimited, and that in the present state of our knowledge it would be rash to fix any limits to the possible. And as for the wave of unbelief which seems at intervals to pass over our younger men, it is not limited to students of natural science; nor if it were, would this in itself condemn the study. Time was when the Church committed the mistake of warning her youth off the ground of Latin and Greek classical literature, because of its pagan associations. Yet the classics have long been the chief stay of secondary education, and have been found invaluable in the training of the Christian clergy. All intellectual pursuits have their perils, and it is not a matter for surprise if an absorbing subject, which is wholly occupied with phenomena, should blind the eyes of many to the things of the Spirit. But if this is so, it is all the more necessary that Christian teachers should remain in touch with the teachers and students of science, and supply what science cannot give, the sense of that great Indwelling Presence, the Wisdom of God, the Mystery of God, which Christians know to have been made flesh of our flesh in the blessed person of Jesus Christ.

I plead, then, for an attitude on the part of the clergy toward the culture and knowledge of our time which shall be neither indifferent or hostile on the one hand, nor weakly concessive on the other. We are bound to resist all demands for the practical abandonment of any article of the faith. Our faces must be set as a flint against outcries of this kind, even when they come, as sometimes they do come, from persons of competent knowledge

and honoured names. We preach Christ incarnate, crucified, risen, coming again; and please God, the Church will preach Him to the end. But we are also bound, as disciples of the Word, as ministers of the Light of men, to welcome all fresh truth, physical, historical, or of whatever kind, not only as truth, but as making in the end for the victory of the Truth itself. All truth is welcome, all is helpful to the servants of the Truth.

It is in this spirit, I trust, that we enter upon the studies of the present meeting. Doubtless we

shall hear things with which we shall not at once agree. But we shall listen with an open mind, as each lecturer gives us of his best from his own peculiar store. It may not be evident at the moment how the information we receive can help us in our great work. But a calmer, wider view of our work will show us that it may. There is no good knowledge, no wisdom, human or divine, that may not contribute in its own measure to that which is the aim and end of our ministry, the fuller, larger, more hopeful, more adequate, and successful preaching of Christ.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Predestination in Islām.¹

THIS little book has several sides of interest. On one it consists strictly of *matériaux pour servir*, a collection of important texts and translations, published here for the first time, and also a translation of the chapter on predestination in al-Bukhārī's great collection of traditions called the *Ṣaḥīḥ*, accompanied by al-Qastalānī's commentary on the same; the last, of course, being generally accessible to Arabists. All these texts thus reproduced belong to what may be called the orthodox development in Islām; they emanate from writers to whom present-day theologians look back with respect as Fathers of the Church. The teachings of those who diverged from the main stream—unbelievers, heretics, simple eccentrics—are not supposed to be represented here.

Further, and this is another side of very great interest, Dr. de Vlieger has had the advantage of actual contact with orthodox Muslim theologians, and has learned to know the theology of Islām as a living phenomenon. He has sat at their feet, studied their systems and has been able to draw through them on that oral tradition which makes so great a part of all Oriental science. That this should have been possible marks a revolution of the most astonishing kind in the world of Islām. It is evident that the gulf of superstition and prejudice is being somewhat bridged, and that

there are at least movements in the great Azhar University of Cairo towards the broad liberty of academic comity. That the English control in Egypt has had some part in this can hardly be doubted.

But the execution of Dr. Vlieger's undertaking is open to some criticism. His plan really called for a statement of the present position of the Muslim Church on predestination, illustrated by extracts from orthodox writers. For such a plan he had an admirable equipment and copious sources, written and oral. Unfortunately he has gone beyond that plan and mixed in other material and remarks which confuse the issue. Thus he has dealt with writers who in no sense could be called orthodox, and has left in obscurity their relationship to the orthodox development. It is always possible to state a single position dogmatically; but when different positions are stated, it becomes necessary to show their genetic relationship, that is, to write a history of Muslim dogmatics. But there Dr. de Vlieger's knowledge evidently failed, and we have mention of, for example, 'Abd ar-Razzāq, the Plotinian Ṣūfī, and Ibn Rushd, the Plotinian Aristotelian, without any suggestion of the distance which separated them from orthodox Islām, or of the paths on which they had diverged. Coming closer to normal Islām, the question might be worth raising what Ibn Jawzī, Ibn Ḥazm, and al-Ghazzālī would have thought of one another. Dr. de Vlieger's Cairene teachers could probably have told him; apparently they did not.

Another criticism which must be made is that

¹ *Kitāb al Qadr. Matériaux pour servir à l'étude de la doctrine de la prédestination dans la théologie musulmane*, par A. de Vlieger, Docteur des Lettres. Leyde: E. J. Brille. 1903. Pp. xvi, 214.

Dr. de Vlieger has not, just as in the last case, always used to the full the help at his hand. There are indications in his book that he has not put himself through that strict course of scholastic metaphysics and theology which he could have had in Cairo, and which was needed for a fundamental grasp of his subject. To a greater degree even than with Thomas Aquinas or Jonathan Edwards, the Muslim scheme of dogmatics goes back to a similar scheme of metaphysics, and is, in the end, unintelligible without it. But on p. 6, for example, a passage is rendered from al-Ghazzālī, the drift of which is completely misunderstood, because the possibilities under the term 'substance,' *jawhar*, had not been grasped. Similar technical terms elsewhere do not seem to have been recognized.

For an extended criticism of details, out of place here, it may be worth while to refer to a review by Goldziher in *Z.D.M.G.*, pp. 592-402. The length, as it is, of the present notice may perhaps be excused by the universal character of the subject. All theologies have to face predestination, and all face it in much the same way.

D. B. MACDONALD.

Hartford.

'Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium.'¹

SOME time ago an important work under the above title was announced to be issued under the editorship of J.-B. Chabot, Ig. Guidi, H. Hyvernat, and B. Carra de Vaux, assisted by other eminent Orientalists. Of this the first part has now appeared, edited by Professor Guidi. It is entitled *Chronica Minora*, and consists of two thin octavo volumes, the first, of pp. 39, containing the Syriac texts of the Edessene Chronicle, and of an anonymous Chronicle composed *circa* 670-680 A.D.; the second, of pp. 32, giving a Latin translation of the Syriac. This first instalment of what is sure to be a widely welcomed work, is very promising, and worthily introduces the 'Corpus' to Oriental students. The Syriac text is printed in a particularly clear and elegant Estrangela, and leaves

nothing to be desired; and the two thin volumes are a pleasure to read and handle, and reflect the utmost credit on the Parisian press, whence they issue.

So far, the very important Edessene Chronicle, extending from 131 B.C. to 540 A.D., and preserved in Cod. Vat. Syr. 163, has only been available in Hallier's edition of 1892, with a German translation; an English version in the *Journal of Sacred Literature*, 1864, vol. v., and in Assemani, *B.O.*, vol. i., text and Latin translation, reprinted by Michaelis in his *Syriac Chrestomathy*, 1783. This new edition, accordingly, will make the Chronicle more accessible to Syriac students, and the editor's great reputation is a sufficient guarantee of its accuracy. The anonymous Chronicle is very little known. It was discovered by Guidi, and published by him in the *Transactions of the Stockholm Congress*, 1889, and again separately in 1891, and a German version of it, with commentary, was issued by Nöldeke in 1893. It is entitled, according to Guidi's Latin, 'Eventus nonnulli ex Qlesastique h. e. narrationibus ecclesiasticis et Qosmostique h. e. narrationibus ad res saeculares pertinentibus, inde a morte Hormizdae filii Chosrois usque ad finem regni Persarum.' Short as the Chronicle is, it is nevertheless of great value. M. Duval speaks of it as, 'cette petite chronique, si précieuse par les nouvelles informations dont elle enrichit notre connaissance des derniers temps des Sassanides.' But the Chronicle is not only important for what it tells us of the great Chosroes and his successors and of the events of their times, but also because it treats of that fateful period when the decay of native Syriac literature began. Starting from the deposition of Hormizd IV., in 590 A.D., it carries us through the years of the desolating wars between Chosroes II. and the Romans, and concludes with the destruction of the Persian empire under Yezdegerd, and the great Muḥammadan invasions of Syria, Palestine, and Egypt. The author of the Chronicle probably drew his information from various sources, and it is not unlikely that what we have is only a part of a larger work. According to Guidi the Chronicle was composed, as noted above, *circa* 670-680 A.D., and consequently not very long after the events finally described in it. The author, therefore, had excellent opportunities of testing the accuracy of his information, and accordingly what he tells us about Isho'yabh I. (581-595 A.D.), Sabhr'ishō (596-604 A.D.), Isho'-

¹ *Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium*. Curantibus J.-B. Chabot, I. Guidi, H. Hyvernat, B. Carra de Vaux. Parisiis, e Typographeo Reipublicae, Carolus Pousielgue. Lipsiae: Otto Harrassowitz, 1903.

yabh II. (628–644 A.D.), the wives of Chosroes, and minor personages, deserves particular attention, especially where he differs from other writers. For instance, it has been said that Isho'yabn I. died in the convent of Hind, but our Chronicle states that he died 'in pago cui nomen est Beth Quši' ('tabernaculis Maadenorum' *B.O.* ii. 415), and that Hind, the daughter of king Nu'man, hearing of his death, went forth from the city of Hertha (al-Hirah) with a company of priests and believers, and carried his body into the city and buried it in her monastery. Again, Bar-Hebraeus (*B.O.* iii. 1. 442), says of Sabhr'ishō that he died during the siege of Dara, while the Chronicle, agreeing with other, as Wright thinks, more correct authorities, says that he died afterwards at Nisibis. Gibbon, too, writing of Siroes or Sheroë, the son and successor of Chosroes II., says that he was the king's eldest son, and that his mother was Sira or Shirin. But the Chronicle clearly states that Shirin's firstborn was Merdانشah, who was murdered by the nobles soon after Sheroë's accession. Chosroes II. had two Christian wives, the celebrated Shirin, an Aramæan, his favourite wife, and Maria, the daughter of the emperor Maurice. These two have been confused by some writers, and Maria has been spoken of as 'alias Sirina,' hence probably Gibbon's error. Yet that Shirin was distinct from Maria ought to have been apparent from what was acknowledged of her nationality, to say nothing about her Persian name, for she was the country-woman of Gregory, who, through her favour and patronage, succeeded Sabhr'ishō as Catholicus, 604 A.D. Now the anonymous Chronicle is quite clear on this point, and distinguishes between Maria the Roman and the Aramæan Shirin.

From what has been said, it is evident that the Chronicle is highly interesting, and is of much historical value, and an English version of it by a competent scholar would be welcomed by those who do not read Syriac, and who are doubtful how far the Latin is everywhere a close translation. It may be said at once that this Latin is on the whole excellently done, yet here and there a closer adherence to the Syriac would have been desirable, especially in reporting speeches. We notice that at times the Latin renders in the third person what the Syriac gives more vividly in the first.

Of the *Chronica Minora* a second part will shortly be edited by Mr. Brooks, and the whole will form the fourth part of the third series of the Syriac

writers to be included in the 'Corpus.' A list of the parts intended to be published, with a prospectus and specimens of the type—Syriac, Ethiopic, Arabic, and Coptic—to be employed has already been issued, and if the future volumes appear at not too distant intervals, and in the same convenient form and well-executed style as the *Chronica Minora*, they will find a ready welcome from Oriental students. The present writer was courteously shown a short time ago, by Professor Guidi, the proof-sheets of the *History of King John I.* (1667–1682 A.D.), which will form part of the second series of the Ethiopic portion of the 'Corpus,' so that probably we shall not have to wait long for this instalment of the work.

ALBERT BONUS.

Alphington, near Exeter.

The Book of Amos.

IN vol. xii. of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, p. 318, there is a short notice of the fourth Beiheft to the *Zeitschrift f. A.T. Wissenschaft*, Löhr's *Untersuchungen zum Buch Amos*. The seventh Beiheft, Baumann's *Aufbau der Amosreden*, is now before us, and discusses the same theme. It is an attempt to rearrange the Book in its original form, putting chapters and verses in their correct order, restoring the proper metres, indicating the strophes. The first half is taken up with literary criticism, by means of which Baumann seeks to determine the general groups of ideas which together make up the prophecy. Two such groups immediately catch the eye; the first consisting of 1²⁻⁸. 13-15 2¹⁻³. 6-11a. 12. 11b. 13. 14a. 16a. 14b 15a 15b 16b, the second embracing 3¹⁻⁵. 6b. 6a. 8 4¹⁻³ 8⁴⁻⁸ 9a^β 9^{aα} 9^{aγ} b. 10. 13. 14. 11a^β 11. 12. Using these as a guide three others may be discovered. Each of the five groups falls into three parts, and there is a logical connexion between the five. In the second half of the essay metrical considerations are applied to the several groups, and the results are found to confirm those previously arrived at: for instance, 5⁷⁻¹⁰⁻¹² has been previously removed from the context on account of its contents, and it is now seen that the group to which the Massoretic Text makes it belong is written in the dirge-metre, whilst itself is in another.

As to the origin and subsequent disarrangement of the prophecies here recorded, Baumann holds

that Amos did not himself write them, but on his return to Judah communicated to friends the substance of his speeches, which were subsequently written down without regard to the order in which they had been delivered, and with the many additions and explanations which distinguish a document from a verbal utterance.

The author of this monograph is not so unwise as to think that he has always hit the mark. A certain amount of arbitrariness is inevitable. But students who have tried to give a clear, detailed summary of each chapter in the Book of Amos will sympathize with anyone who makes a reasonable attempt to bring the *disjecta membra* into their right connexions. In chapter after chapter the same topics crop up in fragmentary forms till we despair of effecting anything save by a radical reconstruction.

Amongst the many suggested emendations of the text, the following may be mentioned:—*מִמְעַנְחוֹ* is struck out of 3⁴, because it is not required by the metre and introduces a discordant idea: a lion roars loudly before taking his prey, but utters only a subdued growl when he has secured it. The interpolation is due to the *מִן־הָאֲדָמָה* of 3⁵.

הַחֲרָבָה is substituted for *הַרְבוֹת* in 4⁹ as yielding a better sense. Metre, grammar, and sense are against *סוֹסִיכִים*, *עַם שְׂבִי* 4¹⁰, *יִצְלַח אִישׁ בְּבֵית יוֹקָם* is preferred in 5⁶, although it is admitted that the verb is usually construed with *עַל* or *אֶל*: it is more likely that we have here a corruption of *שָׁלַח* (1⁴. 7. 10. 12 2⁵).

The very difficult passage, 5²⁶, is put as follows:—

וְנִשְׁאַתֶּם אֶת סִכּוֹת מַלְכֵכֶם | וְאֵת כִּיּוֹן צִלְמֵיכֶם אֲשֶׁר עֲשִׂיתֶם לָכֶם. Baumann does not agree with those who look upon the verse as an interpolation, and is therefore compelled to maintain that *כִּיּוֹן* and *סִכּוֹת* are not names of Saturn; for *סִכּוֹת* he is inclined to read *כִּסּוֹת*. He accepts Riedel's correction of 6¹⁰, *וְנִצְאוּ דִרְוֹ וּמִסְרָפּוֹ* for *וְנִצְאוּ דִרְוֹ וּמִנְרָפָה*, but it may be doubted whether other critics will 'take refuge in the late Hebrew word' *מִנְרָפָה*, especially when *מִנְרָפָה* bears so different a meaning in Jo 1¹⁷, the only place where it occurs. Baumann is probably right in declining to follow the prevalent trend of opinion, which substitutes *דִרְוֹ* for *דִרְךְ* in 8¹⁴: an oath 'by the way to Beer-sheba' is not at all inconceivable; the Arabs swear by the pilgrimage to Mecca. It will be seen that he distrusts the

Received Text of this verse in two particulars:—*אֲשִׁמַּת שׁ' הַנִּשְׁבָּעִים ב' . . . שְׁמֶרָן | וְאָמְרוּ חֵי אֱלֹהֵי דָן* is confessedly difficult, and 'the god of Dan' would correspond perfectly with 'the way of Beer-Sheba,' the *ךְ* afterwards coming in through ditto-graphy.

JOHN TAYLOR.

Winchcombe.

Miscellaneous.

FIVE years ago we had the pleasure of noticing (see THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, May 1898, p. 362), Dr. Wilhelm Capitaine's first work, *de Origenis Ethica*. The favourable opinion we expressed of it has been more than sustained by the verdict of scholars, both Catholic and Protestant. All the warmer will be the welcome now accorded to the same author's account of the ethical system of Clement of Alexandria (*Die Moral des Clemens von Alexandrien*, von Dr. W. Capitaine, Religions- und Oberlehrer am Gymnasium in Eschweiler; Paderborn: Druck und Verlag von F. Schöningh, 1903; price M.7). The book opens with a full description of the importance of ancient Alexandria from the political, social, and scientific points of view. Special treatment is accorded, of course, to the influence exercised on Alexandrian theology by Philo; and our author shows how Clement, like Origen and others, was consciously or unconsciously swayed by the current of Greek-Jewish philosophy. A summary account is given of all that we know of Clement's life and his literary activity, and an estimate is drawn of his influence on subsequent Christian thought. Then come the two main divisions of the book, devoted, respectively, to a general account of the ethical view-point of Clement and a detailed account of his ethics proper. The whole is treated in a manner that leaves nothing to be desired. We may note that the clearness and intelligibility of the discussion are greatly helped by the copious marginal rubrics, and by the relegating of references to footnotes. Dr. Capitaine has laid Christian theology, Catholic and Protestant, under a great obligation by his latest work, and there will be a general wish that he may see his way to give us more of these monographs on Patristic ethics.

Professor Bousset recently published a valuable work entitled *Religion des Judentums im N.T.*

Zeitalter, which was noticed in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES (February 1903, p. 208). That work has been fiercely attacked from a Jewish standpoint by Dr. Felex Perles, who, we are sorry to say, has shown Dr. Bousset neither the courtesy we expect from one scholar to another, nor the respect which is usually accorded by the representatives of one religion to those of another. It augurs ill for the future relations between Jewish and Christian theologians, if we are to have many exhibitions like that of Dr. Perles. And this is not the only case in which one may see cause for anxiety. There are methods of editing and other points connected with the great *Jewish Encyclopedia* now being issued that have provoked an energetic protest from one so well entitled to a hearing as Professor Nestle (see *Theol. Literaturblatt*, 1903, Nos. 17 and 30; *Monatsschrift für die kirchliche Praxis*, September 1903, p. 349 ff.). We feel sure, in any case, that the pamphlet before us, which Dr. Bousset has felt compelled to write in answer to Dr. Perles' attack, will be admitted by every impartial judge to accomplish its object, not only convicting Dr. Perles of the discourtesy to which we have referred, but proving conclusively that, whether from haste or for some other reason, he has misapprehended the view-point of Dr. Bousset's book (*Volksfrömmigkeit und Schriftgelehrtentum: Antwort auf Herrn Perles' Kritik meiner 'Religion des Judentums im N.T. Zeitalter,' von Dr. W. Bousset; Berlin: Reuther & Reichard, 1903; price 80 pfennigs*).

Professor von Dobschütz, so well known as an authority on Christian antiquities, has issued a pamphlet under the title *Ostern und Pfingsten* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs; price 80 pf.). The title gives little clue to the contents, which are of vital interest on account of their bearing on the subject of our Lord's resurrection. It would be impossible,

without using much space, to indicate what are the contentions of our author, but we feel sure that these will receive the attention due to their being partly novel, and to their being put forward in so weighty a name.

All students of the Old Testament will welcome Dr. Nestle's *Septuagintastudien* iv. (Stuttgart: Druck der Stuttgarter Vereins-Buchdruckerei). The character of these *Studies* is too well known from Dr. Nestle's previous publications of the same kind to need description. Hence we shall content ourselves with merely indicating the contents of this latest production. In the 'Vorbemerkung' occasion is taken from an unaccountable slip in Harnack's *Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums* to discuss the text of Ps 16(17)¹⁹. Then the *Studies* proper deal with the Prayer of Manasses, the Book of Tobit, the Book of Baruch (1. the history of the printed text; 2. the relation of the Book of Baruch to the Greek Jeremiah), the Epistle of Jeremy, the text of 2 Maccabees.

Professor Bacher of Budapest (known to readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for the part he took against Professor Margoliouth's now exploded theory of the Hebrew Sirach, and to students of the *Dictionary of the Bible* by his articles 'Sanhedrin' and 'Synagogue') has had the kindness to send us the 26th *Jahresbericht* of the Landes-Rabbinerschule of Budapest, which of course derives its main interest, as usual, from the prefatory portion, which is the work of Professor Bacher himself. Rabbinical students will be glad to have the full title, and will know what to expect from Professor Bacher. It runs: *Aus dem Wörterbuche Tanchum Jeruschalmi's; nebst einem Anhang über den sprachlichen Charakter des Maimunischen Mischne-Tora.*

J. A. SELBIE.

Maryculter, Aberdeen.

Problems in the Gospels.

BY PROFESSOR THE REV. C. A. BRIGGS, D.D., LITT.D., UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, NEW YORK.

III.

Where was Jesus during the absence of the Twelve?

THIS question pressed itself upon me with great power during the past winter while lecturing upon the life of Jesus, until at last the solution came which I shall give in this article.

I have asked several eminent New Testament scholars, but not one of them had thought of it before, or could give me an answer. So far as I am aware, the harmonists and authors of Lives of Jesus have not considered it.

The sending forth of the Twelve was for a mission in Galilee (Mk 6⁷⁻¹³, Mt 9^{36-11¹}, Lk 9¹⁻⁶). They went in pairs, therefore in six different circuits. This mission must have taken some considerable time; for it contemplates the going from one city to another and from house to house, and the sojourning for a time in houses and cities, because directions are given respecting just these things. All this could not have been accomplished in a few days. A comprehensive mission seems to have been contemplated so as to reach entire Galilee.

The return is given in close connexion with the sending in Mk 6³⁰, Lk 9¹⁰. These Evangelists insert accounts of the death of John the Baptist (Mk 6¹⁴⁻²⁹ = Lk 9⁷⁻⁹), motivated by the fact that Herod heard of the great work of Jesus, and was so disturbed by it that he supposed that John the Baptist had risen from the dead in Jesus. This is given by Matthew (14¹⁻¹²) immediately before the feeding of the multitude, without any mention of the return of the Twelve. That Gospel inserts a considerable amount of material here.

(1) An account of the message of the Baptist to Jesus (11²⁻¹⁹), which is given by Luke at an earlier and more probable date (7¹⁸⁻³⁵), and then (2) a number of logia (11²⁰⁻³⁰), the most of which are given by Luke more appropriately in connexion with the return of the Seventy (10¹³⁻²⁴). Matthew also gives, before the feeding of the multitudes, various incidents reported by Mark and Luke at other dates as follows:—(3) Mt 12¹⁻²¹ = Mk 2^{23-3¹²} =

Lk 6¹⁻¹¹; (4) Mt 12²²⁻⁵⁰ = Mk 3^{19b-35}—incidents given by Luke at two different times, the former (11¹⁴⁻³⁶) at a later date, the latter (8¹⁹⁻²¹) at an earlier date; (5) Mt 13¹⁻⁵⁸, the parables by the sea = Mk 4¹⁻³⁴ = Lk 8⁴⁻¹⁸; and (6) Mt 13⁵⁴⁻⁵⁸, the rejection at Nazareth = Mk 6¹⁻⁶ = Lk 4¹⁶⁻³⁰.

Mark and Luke make no statement whatever as to what Jesus did in the absence of the Twelve. But Matthew tells us (11¹): '*And it came to pass, when Jesus had made an end of commanding His twelve disciples, He departed thence to teach and preach in their cities.*' This is a general statement, which this Gospel adds to the Markan source, and is indeed most probable in itself. But it does not tell us where Jesus carried on His ministry. It is not probable that He reserved a seventh circuit in Galilee to Himself, or that He went with one pair on one of these circuits. It is much more probable that having divided up Galilee among the Twelve, He Himself, either alone or, more likely, with one of these pairs, went elsewhere to carry on His ministry. The insertion of so many incidents by Matthew prior to the feeding of the multitudes, in connexion with which Mark, followed by Luke, gives the return of the Twelve, although Matthew does not mention the return at all, yet implies that the author of this Gospel supposed there was a considerable ministry of Jesus during that interval. Some of these incidents given by Matthew in this interval really belong there. But Mark's order in most cases is to be preferred; in others, that of Luke. We must recognize the effort of the author of Matthew to fill up this gap.

If it is reasonable to suppose that Jesus, during the absence of the Twelve, would carry on His ministry elsewhere than in Galilee, then we have a gap of time in which we may place the Jerusalem ministry of the Gospel of John and the Peræan ministry of the Gospel of Luke, both absent from the Gospel of Mark because Peter was on a mission in Galilee all this time. And, indeed, this ministry in Jerusalem and Peræa fits into this space with the utmost exactness and nicety. It is evident from Mark and Luke that the anxiety of Herod was a real peril for the continuance of Jesus' work, and was a sufficient motive for giving over His

Galilean ministry to the Twelve, while He Himself retired elsewhere.

Luke (9⁵¹⁻⁵⁸), at the beginning of the material derived by this Evangelist from another source than Mark, tells us that Jesus set His face to go to Jerusalem, and that He went by way of Samaria. This unusual route to Jerusalem instead of the usual route by the valley of the Jordan was doubtless because of the peril from Herod and the need of a secret journey. The brother pair, James and John, accompanied Him on this journey to Jerusalem, as is evident from the first incident in Samaria, where their names are mentioned and no others. There is no evidence of the presence of any others of the Twelve.

This journey may be put in parallelism with the journey described in Jn 7²⁻¹⁴. Jesus does not go up to the Feast of Tabernacles with His brethren in a public way, but in secret; and He does not appear in public until the midst of the feast (7¹⁰⁻¹⁴). During this feast the visit to Martha and Mary in Bethany (Lk 10³⁸⁻⁴²) doubtless occurred. It is probable that the Seventy were sent forth from Jerusalem on their mission to Peræa and Judæa. From Jerusalem Jesus follows in the footsteps of the Seventy in a ministry in Peræa (Lk 10²⁶⁻³⁷, 11-13²¹), which concludes with a journey to Jerusalem (Lk 13²²). This journey seems to correspond with that reported in Jn 10²²⁻³⁹ at the Feast of Dedication, from which He returns to Peræa (Jn 10⁴⁰).

The ministry in Peræa included the incidents and teaching mentioned in Lk 14-17¹⁰, for the most part at least, although the exact connexion of the logia is by no means certain. From this ministry Jesus is suddenly recalled to Jerusalem by the death of Lazarus (Jn 11). The raising of Lazarus from the dead excited so great attention that Jesus was in great danger from the authorities, and He retires to Ephraim on the borders of Samaria (Jn 11⁵⁴).

It is probable that the journey northward to Galilee through Samaria (Jn 4³⁻⁴⁸) occurred at this time. He was in peril, both from the authorities of Jerusalem and also from Herod, and the safest journey was just this one. He was on the borders of Samaria at Ephraim, and the journey through Samaria was the easiest from this place. The statement 'Say not ye, There are yet four months, and then cometh the harvest?' (Jn 4³⁵) exactly suits this time. Moreover, the explicit statement

of His Messiahship suits this period of His ministry, and could hardly have come much earlier.

The order of the material of John is certainly not chronological but topical, as Tatian recognized. He puts the journey through Samaria after Mk 7²⁴⁻³⁷. At this time John and James alone of the Twelve were with Jesus, and therefore John's Gospel tells us of these things and Peter's Gospel does not mention them. Indeed, these brothers would be especially valuable to Jesus in Jerusalem because of their important acquaintanceship there (Jn 18¹⁵⁻¹⁶).

Arriving in Galilee, Jesus comes at once into peril from Herod, and therefore He avoids renewing His ministry in Galilee and hurries northward to Tyre and Sidon (Mk 7²⁴⁻³⁰). It is probable that the preaching in Nazareth and His rejection there occurred on His way. The Synoptists are in disagreement as to the time (Mk 6¹⁻⁶, Mt 13⁵⁴⁻⁵⁸, Lk 4¹⁶⁻³⁰). It is more appropriate here because of the explicit statement of Jesus' Messiahship with the implication of His impending sufferings and the hostile temper of the Nazarenes. The logion Jn 4⁴⁴ certainly was uttered at Nazareth, and suggests that the discourse at Nazareth immediately followed the journey through Samaria. As I shall show later, there has been a displacement of the original John in this place.

Here Mark resumes his narrative, and it is probable that Peter and Andrew join Jesus at Nazareth for the journey northward, while John and James depart. From Phœnicia Jesus journeys along the northern borders of Galilee to Northern Decapolis (Mk 7³¹), and so to Bethsaida, where He is rejoined by the entire Twelve (Mk 6³⁰ = Lk 9¹⁰). It is significant that the feeding of the four thousand, which is probably only a variant tradition of the feeding of the five thousand, is placed by Mark (8¹⁻⁹) and Matthew (15³²⁻³⁸) after the journey from Sidon by way of Decapolis. The feeding of the five thousand is reported in John (6¹⁻¹⁵). Andrew and Philip, representing two pairs of the Twelve, are mentioned as with Him. It is also stated that 'the passover, the feast of the Jews, was at hand' (Jn 6⁴), which exactly suits this time. The harmonists, even Tatian, place this event too early, and therefore find it difficult to explain the discourse of Jesus in Capernaum, which follows just after crossing the sea (Jn 6¹⁶⁻⁶⁶), which offends many of His disciples and brings on the crisis in which the Twelve recognize Him distinctly as

the Messiah. Jn 6¹⁷ states that He crossed to Capernaum; Mk 6⁵³, Mt 14³⁴ to the plain of Gennesaret; Mt 15³⁹ that He crossed to the borders of Magadan, Mk 8¹⁰ to the parts of Dalmanutha. Mk 6⁴⁵ states that their real destination was Bethsaida. Gennesaret is a general term of the plain on the border of which Capernaum was situated. Magadan may be another name for Magdala, which is on the south side of the plain, as Capernaum is on the north. Dalmanutha may be a more precise designation of the place, which has not yet been identified. All these places were within a few miles of each other. The calm after the storm compelled them to seek the nearest land. But that the original plan of going to Bethsaida was carried out is evident from the healing of the blind man there (Mk 8²²⁻²⁶) before the journey north to Cæsarea Philippi.

This is the readjustment of the order of events in the life of Jesus which is required by the answer to the question, *Where was Jesus during the absence*

of the Twelve? It solves a number of the most difficult problems of the New Testament, explains the silence of Mark as to the ministry in Peræa and Judæa, and the full report of John as to the Jerusalem ministry, and his implicit agreement with the full report of Luke as to the Peræan ministry. It also fills the gap in time which the absence of ten of the Twelve requires by a sufficient amount of active ministry of Jesus to satisfy all conditions of the problem. It also explains the movements of Jesus in accordance with the perils of His position, and enables us to see how the crisis is brought on which finally removes every reason for caution, and justifies Him in making a distinct announcement of His Messiahship. Thus He secures His definite acceptance as Messiah by His chief disciples, and is enabled to give them a clear warning of His impending death and resurrection just before He makes His last journey to Jerusalem, to the cross and the crown.

Point and Illustration.

He saw the Heavens opened.—Mr. F. B. Meyer took the Temptation for the subject of his address at the Manchester Mission recently. He spoke of Jesus being driven into the wilderness, and he said: 'There is a difference between a wilderness and a desert. A desert is an ocean of burning sand, where God bakes the winds and makes possible the trade-winds; but a wilderness is used in the Bible perpetually as rather a lonely spot where no blue smoke climbs from the shepherd's cot, where no boy is heard whistling or calling to his sheep, where only the cry of the grouse, where only the low growl of the beast of prey as he goes forth at night upon his prowls, only the sounds of nature and the sob of the wind over the grass, only such sounds as these are heard.'

He spoke also of the opening of the heavens that came between the Baptism and the Temptation, and he said: 'Jesus Christ had stood under the open sky, and, as I read the Gospels, He had only stood there for a minute. The open sky was but for a very brief space. If you ask me what the open sky meant, I reply that, in my judgment, it was the revelation to Jesus Christ of new spiritual

forces that lay within His reach. I will not further dwell on that thought; it is an inviting, a wonderfully inviting subject, but I believe the development of Jesus Christ in knowledge and power had been constantly increasing until He had come to a moment when He not only knew exactly who He was, and whence He came, but whence He was going, that in order to move the world He must lay hold upon those heavenly forces that lie within the reach of every faithful touch. It was just as when Newton discovered the law of gravitation and heaven was opened to him, or Watt discovered the law of steam, and a new driving motor force was revealed to him, and as I the other day for the first time saw ether burning in its blue flame and saw the driving force of the next twenty years. So Jesus Christ had seen the heavens opened. But it was only for a moment, and only John and He saw it. It was but a flash, and then the clouds gathered again, and He was "driven."

The Carpenter's Shop.—How far is it lawful to go in the imagination of scenes which the Gospels do not record? Is it lawful to imagine

them at all? In the sermon already referred to, Mr. F. B. Meyer tells how the news of John the Baptist's preaching was carried to a carpenter's shop in Nazareth: 'The news that God's voice had spoken again after four hundred years of silence thrilled the country. The tidings sped up to Jerusalem, and all Jerusalem poured her crowds down until the Jordan valley was blocked with people; and the tidings rolled up the funnel of the long valley of the Jordan to the Lake of Galilee, where men were drying their nets, and they poured down—the youth especially of Galilee—to be the disciples of John; and the news was diverted from that main channel until it reached the place where Nazareth lay, and came one afternoon, as I imagine it, to the open door of the carpenter's shop, when some breathless messenger burst in and said, "The Lord cometh, the Lord cometh! The voice of the forerunner has been heard in the land." He little knew how his message thrilled the young carpenter, who stood there knee-deep in shavings which had curled up from the boards. And that evening Christ was longer away from the village home than usual in meditation on the hills, the great silent hills that lay around the village; and then in the morning, early rising, He took an affectionate farewell of Mary, and Mary knew that the hour had come by a kind of subtle instinct, and the two parted, never to meet quite like that again, save perhaps at the Cross.'

An Unconscious Mystic.—The Rev. Wentworth Webster, M.A., is Corresponding Member of the Royal Academy of History in Madrid, and he has spent his time searching into the byways of Spanish religious history. Article after article has appeared in the *Anglican Church Magazine* or the *Foreign Church Chronicle*, each article separated from ordinary magazine articles by the style of the raconteur (that style which in poetry distinguishes the ballad from other literature). Now he has gathered these out-of-the-way articles into a book, with sundry touches to date. The book is called *Gleanings in Church History* (S.P.C.K.; 4s.). One chapter discusses the meaning of I.P. and the origin of R.I.P.; another Santa Teresa. One describes a Spanish New Year Service, another La Petite Eglise. One is a history of the Spanish Church up to 1000; another is an estimate of Spanish Mysticism. In the chapter on Spanish Mysticism, the mysticism of Valdés and Molinos,

Mr. Webster says: 'True mysticism may be often found among the rude and illiterate, who can hardly express their ideas in speech, still less in writing. "Can you tell me what particular thing led to your conversion?" asked a clergyman of a humble member of his congregation. "Why, sir, it was hearing Mr. — read one morning in church, As the Lord of hosts liveth, before whom I stand." "Those are striking words; but I do not see how they led to your conversion." "Don't you see, sir? 'before whom I stand,'—*I felt myself standing before God.*" This unlettered man was a far truer mystic than many who have tried to write themselves as such.'

The Soul's Leap to God.—'I read in the newspaper the other day of a wonderful invention to be used in war. It was a *bomb*, with such materials inside the shell, and so contrived as to explode at the touch of a ray of light! The bomb might be placed anywhere and do no harm; but let a ray of light fall upon it in particular, and on the instant, at the summons of the light, the thing would awake and burst. Well, that is a very exact summary of Robert Browning's teaching on the conversion of the soul, or the soul's discovery of God.'

Thus Mr. John A. Hutton, M.A., who has dared to publish another book on Browning, begins his second chapter. He afterwards says: 'I regard Browning's teaching on conversion as his supreme message to our time. It is that teaching, as it seems to me, which ranks him with the prophets. Valuable as is the light which he sheds upon those problems of life and experience which are as old as man, or at least, as old as the days of reflexion; splendid as is the courage with which he girds his loins, and faces the darkness and the doubt; yet more solitary and distinguished is his teaching on the soul of man, his impassioned confidence that the soul may, in one grand moment, leap sheer out of any depth of shame or subtle homage, and leap to the breast of God.'

That shows that Mr. Hutton owes much to Browning. When the book has done its work Browning will owe something to Mr. Hutton. It is published by Messrs. Oliphant of Edinburgh. Its title is *Guidance from Robert Browning in Matters of Faith* (2s. 6d. net).

The Instinct of Peril.—There may be less

prayer, as the pessimist tells us, than formerly, but there is more writing about it. A volume on prayer is nearly as sure among the month's publications as a volume of sermons. This month it comes from America, through the Fleming H. Revell Company, whose publishing office for this country is at 30 St. Mary Street, Edinburgh. Its author is Dr. David Gregg of Brooklyn.

The point of insistence in this book is the place of prayer among the forces that move the machinery of the world, and he calls it *Individual Prayer as a Working-Force* (2s. net). In the last chapter his subject is Christ at prayer on our behalf, the text being, 'I pray not that thou shouldest take them out of the world, but that thou shouldest keep them from the evil' (Jn 17¹⁵). How is that prayer answered? How does Christ's prayer keep us from the evil that is in the world? Following Mr. W. L. Watkinson, Dr. Gregg says in two ways. The one way is by putting in us *the instinct of peril*; the other by granting us *a hidden life filled with Himself*.

What is this instinct of peril? 'In India butterflies migrate to escape the monsoon. They have a meteorological sense, which gives them an intimation of low-pressure and warns them to haste away. It like manner God gives to all sincere men a similiar instinct for moral peril—a sensibility of sin, a pain to feel it near. Goethe sets this forth in his tragedy of Faust. In that tragedy Margaret, who represents virgin-purity, cannot bear the sight of Mephistopheles. Though he is disguised as an honourable knight and she has no idea who he is, she shrinks from him. She has a keen instinct of moral peril—

In all my life not anything
Has given my heart so sharp a sting
As that man's loathsome visage.

You begin to read a certain book, as Mr. Watkin-

son says, and you do not like it, you suspect it morally. It is certainly not high in its tone. You cannot put your objection into words, but the shrinking from it is there. That is the action of the instinct of peril. Drop the book at once. Your separation to God in this case lies in following the instinct. Guard the bloom on the peach. It is essential; for just where the bloom is rubbed off, at that precise point decay sets in. Honour the instinct of peril, and remember this: In a life of holiness there is no place for presumption.'

Turning over a New Leaf. — The Rev. L. Maclean Watt, B.D., of Alloa, who has published a volume of Communion addresses, through Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton (*The Communion Table*; 3s. 6d.), will not murmur nor complain if we say that the best of it is its poetry. The poetry is often the best thing in a sermon, and the remark is hard upon the sermon. But here the poetry is the preacher's own. Nor does it mean that he is a better poet than a preacher, for he preaches by his poetry. Opposite each sermon's opening words are found a line or two. This is the finest of them all we think—

Carry me over the long, last mile,
Man of Nazareth, Christ for me!
Weary I wait by Death's dark style,
In the wild and the waste where the wind blows free:
And the shadows and sorrows, come out of my past,
Look keen through my heart,
And will not depart,
Now that my poor world has come to its last.
Lord, is it long that my spirit must wait,
Man of Nazareth, Christ for me!
Deep is the stream, and the night is late,
And grief blinds my soul that I cannot see . . .
Speak to me, out of the silences, Lord,
That my spirit may know,
As forward I go,
That Thy pierced hands are lifting me over the ford!

Christianity a Prophetic Religion.

BY THE REV. W. F. COBB, D.D., RECTOR OF ST. ETHELBURGA'S, LONDON.

THE days of Jesus were days of great expectations. The Messianic hope had been suggested by the prophets, and nurtured among the quiet in the land. It had mastered the populace, been accepted by the Pharisees, and was tolerated by the Saddu-

cean aristocracy. The further Jehovah had retired in the highest heaven, the lower the national and religious condition of Israel, the more fiercely burned the hope of the coming of the Anointed One. But that hope was of many colours. For

the most part it looked for a King, who was to be of David's line. He would be a conqueror. He should be a Judge. He was to work miracles. He was to be a Prophet. He was to apply the sacred law with authority. But Jewish thought made one significant exception. The high priest was too much of a politician to be a religious guide, and the scribe had become his too successful rival. Consequently the Messiah was not, before Christian times, thought of as a priest. That there should come a King, a Judge, a Saviour, a Prophet,—such were the hopes which were focused on Jesus, as He began preaching the gospel of the kingdom.

For us, however, the all-important question is: How far did He adopt them, and in what way did He modify them? Jewish piety had furnished the molten metal; it was Jesus who stamped it with His own seal. What then was that seal like?

In the first place, He made it quite clear that He was not another Rabbi come to comment on the Law. He spoke with authority, but not as the scribes. His whole teaching was one continuous criticism of a religion which put a book between God and man.

In the second place, He laid little or no stress on works of power. The only sign He would give would be that of Jonah, the presence of a preacher of righteousness. Those who would believe if only a miracle were wrought, He repelled as an 'evil and adulterous generation.' He declared the wisdom of God, and expected that wisdom would be justified by her own children.

In the third place, He claimed a Kingship, but a Kingship of so refined and lofty a character that to most people it seemed, and still seems, no Kingship at all. From the beginning He refused to have anything to do with a rule based on force. To use force to prop up religion was to fall down and worship Satan. His followers should not fight, nor would He. If they took the sword they should perish with the sword. He would be a King, but not in that world where competition is the law of life.

In the fourth place, He put His prophetic office in the first rank. When He was rejected, He pointed out that no prophet was acceptable in his own country. He must die in Jerusalem, for no prophet perished out of it. His chief activity consisted in the prophetic work of preaching and teaching. He told Pilate that He came to do

what every prophet does, to bear witness to the Truth. He told His mission-preachers that he who received them as prophets would be receiving Him, and warned them that they would be persecuted as all prophets before them had been. He reminded the Scribes and Pharisees that they were sons of them who slew the prophets, and bade them be true to their fathers by killing Him.

Accordingly, it was as 'a prophetic Man mighty in word and deed' that Cleopas described Him. He was the Prophet foretold by Moses, St. Peter told the men of Israel in Solomon's Porch. And what was more, His own Spirit lived on in the Church of the first three generations, and made it to be above all things a Church which either consisted of prophets, or else held them in the highest honour.

The importance of this truth to us lies in the contribution it makes to the answer to be given to a question which we are all asking to-day, 'What is Christianity?' Our age is one which is careful and troubled about many things. It is an Age of Faith, but of Faith which is bewildered by the strife of tongues. It has its own inner certainty, but it cannot give it proper expression in a society where 'each one hath a psalm, hath a teaching, hath a revelation, hath a tongue, hath an interpretation'; in a society, too, where men are more concerned to prove others wrong than themselves right. The confusion is not made clear by any tabulating of the conditions of Christendom as they exist to-day. It is not got rid of by systematic theology, which is, after all, but a philosophy in disguise. Even historical theology, which is one of the two tools given us to work with in our reshaping of Christian truth, is of little use by itself. One other is wanted, is indispensable, and that is the Spirit of Prophecy.

What then is this Spirit? It is, first, the faculty of inner vision. As in Euclid there are certain axioms on which the whole superstructure of Propositions is built up; so in the religious life there are certain first principles which are seen by the inner eye, and carry with them their own credentials. They are the master-light of all his seeing to him who has them; they do not rest on sense-perceptions, or on logical reasonings. The man of science may describe them as the inheritance of the race in the individual. The Man of God says they are the voice of the Spirit. In

either case they can neither be explained nor explained away.

In Jesus the Christ this Spirit dwelt in fullest strength, for God gave not the Spirit by measure unto Him. He spoke of what He saw, with a calm and matter-of-fact certainty stronger than all reasoning. As a prophet He did not argue, He affirmed. In a world where there is so much to give the lie to that Faith which holds fast to unseen Goodness, the affirmation of the Christ that, in spite of all to the contrary, God is to us as our Father, still remains the fundamental truth of our religion; and it offers and requires no further proof than the word of Him who made it common coin. He that hath seen Him hath seen God. Jesus Christ is for man the transparency of the Father. The authority with which He spoke astonished the people of His day, because of its first-hand character. He needed not to look outside Himself for truths about the Father, about life and the spirit world, for He had the witness in Himself. His sinless soul was a mirror in which the Divine found Itself perfectly revealed. What He saw there He saw clearly, and stated with certainty. He was a Prophet, yea, and more than a Prophet. To other Prophets the word of God came, but He was to man the word of God itself.

This truth explains the freedom of the way in which He treated orthodoxy. That He loved the Law and the Temple is plain; that He stood above them in sovereign freedom is plain also. His soul had been nourished on Deuteronomy, the Psalms, and Isaiah. The zeal of His Father's house consumed Him, and yet He could put His own prophetic 'I say unto you,' against what was said in the Law, 'to them of old time.' He could declare that, if the Temple at Jerusalem were destroyed, He could build up another and a better, in the hearts of those who had learned to worship God as Spirit in spirit and in truth. He accepted Church and Bible as historical products, enshrining spiritual truths, but He knew how to distinguish the earlier truth from the later, the lower from the higher. He read the Book of Leviticus and summed it up in the precept: 'Love thy neighbour as thyself.' He read Deuteronomy and expressed it all in the saying, 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with an undivided heart.' He would leave the law of tithes unrepealed, but He would subordinate it to 'judgment and the

love of God.' He would observe the Sabbath, but only as it sprang from love and ministered to love. But He removed once and for all the obligatory character of the Law of Moses, by the far-reaching pronouncement that not what goeth into a man defileth him, but what comes out. But if He opposed the rabbinical doctrine of verbal inspiration as unspiritual, He found Himself in opposition for the same reason to the church authorities of His day. He was willing to allow official authority its place, on the one condition that it regarded itself as the instrument of religion, pure and undefiled. Where it was but external authority, maintaining social order on politic, or merely conservative grounds, He judged it by the standard set by all prophets, that of the truth of God seen within.

The example of our Lord should be a lantern to our feet to-day. To us, as to Him, Church and Bible are the precious records of God's dealings with our fathers. They have been to us all the voice of God in ways that none of us can wholly discern. They have stimulated, instructed, comforted, warned. Without them we should not be what we are. But they form but one focus of the ellipse. The inner light is the other. Without both the perfect Christian cannot be. The prophetic Church and the prophetic Bible must be interpreted by the prophetic spirit. The Church—so far as it is a Church, and not a civil polity—owed its origin and growth to the spirit of prophecy. The Bible, as a book of religion, and not of history or archæology, came from the pen of prophets. All that is precious and permanent in both is of prophetic power.

This being the case, we have to remember that it is unlawful to allow theories about Church and Bible to quench the prophetic spirit. For freedom is the very life-blood of the prophet. Never was there a time, perhaps, when liberty of prophesying for clergy and laity alike, was more needed than to-day. Never was there a time, some will say, nor a country, nor a church where this liberty was more used than in ours. That may be so, but confusion caused by the very exuberance of our life is better than stagnation. Stamp out if you will all activity which springs from conceit, self-seeking, from mere conservatism or party-spirit, but beware how you hinder in the least degree the working of the spirit of prophecy. After all, the spirit of the individual prophet is subject to the

spirit of prophecy in general. His aberrations will be corrected, and His truth recognized, by all who are prophets indeed. And besides all this, behind all prophesying is the Spirit of Truth, who will know how to safeguard His own, if only we are patient enough. Men have tried from the days of the Deuteronomist to those of *The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* to formulate rules by which the true prophet shall be discriminated from the false. But from the nature of the case such rules must be useless. There is but one rule, and that given by the Master Himself. 'By their fruits ye shall know them.' Our God is, above all things, holy love, and he is a false prophet whose teaching tends to obscure that love. But we must often be content to give the seed time to mature into fruit before we pass judgment. And in any case we must remember that as religious history is the product of the work of prophets in the past, so each of us, humble though we may be, is adding something to that history still, that is, if the Spirit of Jesus dwell in us. By the same spirit of prophecy we shall determine our attitude towards the existing system of things in Church and State, politics, art, or science. We shall not be revolutionaries any more than the Lord Himself was. We shall treat it in every case as a valuable heirloom from the past, but as an unfinished *torso*, to which we have to contribute some perfecting touches. If, however, it claims papal authority over the prophetic spirit which is ours, we shall oppose it with all our spiritual force, for the same reasons which made the Lord pronounce His 'Woe' upon the Scribes and Pharisees.

But the second function of the prophet is that he should tell out what he has seen of God within, and this power is, as a rule, proportioned to the clearness of his vision. The prophet's

prayer is 'Speak, that I may see Thee,' and, when God has spoken, He too speaks out in his turn and says, 'Come hither and hearken all ye fearers of God, and I will tell you what He hath done for my soul.' 'No one who is endued with any portion of the prophetic spirit can keep it to himself. He is driven by the power within to communicate it to his fellows. This was the secret of the activity of a Savonarola, a Francis, a Bernard, a Wesley, and a Luther. Each spoke because he must. If we do not speak in our place, high or low, it is because we have not been careful to cherish the gift of the prophetic spirit.

Lastly, Jesus saw clearly that a Kingship based on prophetic powers must be rejected by the mass of men, and that the rejection must be accompanied by suffering. Hence, for a militant and triumphant Messiah He substituted One who should reign from the tree of suffering. He accepted this as the law of His life. It was the will of His Father, and He could say under the shadow of His Cross, 'Thy will be done.' But the servant must be as His Master. Each in his turn must be touched with the coal from off the prophetic fire. Each must go forth and declare the truth given him. Each must expect and welcome opposition. Each must be the object of such persecution as the age he lives in allows; the cross under a Tiberius; the headsman under a Nero; the heretic's pyre under an Alexander III., or a Philip of Spain, or a Calvin; ostracism, deposition, the sneer, the faint praise, the neglect and scorn of a softer age. The prophet will not complain, for he will recollect that so persecuted they before him the greatest of all the Prophets. And if called upon to fill up what remains behind of the sufferings of his Lord, he will remember that the testimony of Jesus is the Spirit of Prophecy.

Requests and Replies.

For the benefit of one who has neither the means to procure, nor the time to study, such standard works as Driver's *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, can you recommend any book that will give a short and reliable account of the present position of critical opinion regarding the Pentateuch?—W.

BEYOND all doubt, the book for the above purpose is *The Pentateuch in the Light of To-day*, by A.

Holborn (T. & T. Clark, 1902; price 2s. net). So high an authority as the *Revue Biblique* recently (July 1903) spoke very favourably of the way in which Mr. Holborn's work accomplishes its aim, and noted with admiration the success with which the proportion between details and results is maintained. The treatment of the subject is at once thoroughly scholarly and perfectly popular, while

the tone of the book is in every way admirable. Either for private study or in the hands of a capable teacher, Mr. Holborn's little work is calculated to render excellent service as presenting an interesting and reliable view of what believing criticism has to say of the history and value of the Pentateuch.

J. A. SELBIE.

Maryculter, Aberdeen.

Ezekiel xiii. 18-21.

In Frazer's *Golden Bough* (i. 277) the custom of stealing or hunting the soul is referred to. It might be caught in a scarf. 'In Fiji, if a criminal refused to confess, the chief sent for a scarf with which "to catch away the soul of the rogue."'

Or it might be taken in a snare. 'The sorcerers of Danger Island used to set snares for souls. The snares were made of stout cinet, about fifteen to thirty feet long, with loops on either side of different sizes to suit different sizes of souls; for fat souls there were large loops, for thin souls there were small ones.'

Is it possible to see a connexion with this practice in Ezk xiii. 18-21? 'Woe to the women that . . . make kerchiefs for the head of persons of every stature to hunt souls! . . . Behold, I am against your pillows, wherewith ye there hunt the souls to make them fly [margin, 'as birds'], and I will tear them from your arms; and I will let the souls go, even the souls ye hunt [as birds]. Your kerchiefs also will I tear, and deliver my people out of your hand, and they shall be no more in your hand to be hunted.'

In the *Dictionary of the Bible*, 'bands or fillets' is given for 'pillow.'—H. M.

THE practices described in the *Golden Bough* appear to belong to a different category from those referred to in Ezk 13¹⁸⁻²¹. The latter passage contains expressions that are obscure, but its general meaning is plain. The prophet is inveighing against women in Israel who falsely claimed the gift of prophecy and who practised divination. They wore, and made those who came to consult them wear, amulets and fillets, which were supposed to possess virtues analogous to the phylacteries and the prayer-tallith of later times, so that the wearers of them were introduced into the magical circle. By such arts and pretensions these sorceresses hunted for human victims, as the fowler seeks to ensnare birds. But there is no thought of the literal 'hunting of souls' described by Dr. Frazer. In all probability the Hebrew term *nēphāshôth*, here rendered 'souls,' means nothing more than 'persons,' a sense it bears elsewhere in Ezekiel (cf. 17¹⁷ 18⁴ 22²⁷) and in other passages of the O.T. (Gn 31⁶, Ex 12⁴ 16¹⁶, Nu 19¹⁸, Lv 18²⁹ 20²⁵ 27², 2 K 12⁵, Pr 11⁸⁰ 14²⁵). The promise of Ezk 13²⁰ ('I will let the souls go,' etc.) finds a parallel in Ps 124⁷ ('Our soul is escaped as a bird out of the snare of the fowlers,' A.V. and R.V.), where, similarly, the word *naphshēnū*, rendered 'our soul,' means, by a Hebrew idiom, simply 'we.' J. A. SELBIE.

Maryculter, Aberdeen.

Recent Biblical and Oriental Archaeology.

I WOULD draw the attention of Old Testament scholars to an article in the April number of the *Princeton Theological Review* by Professor R. D. Wilson, in which an examination is made, from a purely philological point of view, of the close relationship alleged to exist between the languages, traditions, and religions of Babylonia and Israel. The article is naturally named after the famous lectures of Professor Delitzsch, 'Babylon and Israel.' Professor Wilson is a good Hebraist, though his knowledge of Assyrian seems to me to be too much derived from the study of a dictionary; his examination of the relationship of the vocabularies of the two languages is, however,

searching and scholarly, and it is the first time that it has been made with anything like the same amount of thoroughness. The results at which he arrives will be a surprise to many, and are summed up in the closing words of his article. He concludes that there was nothing but 'a long line of opposition between the religions and the policy of the Hebrews and Babylonians, which extends from the time when Abraham was called out of Ur of the Chaldees, to leave his country and his kindred, until, in the Apocalypse and the later Jewish literature, Babylon became the height and front of the offending against the kingdom of the God of Israel. All through that extended and extensive literature

of the ancient Hebrews, all through those long annals of the Assyrians and Babylonians, wherever the Hebrews and the Assyrio-Babylonians were brought into contact, it was by way of opposition.'

There was a time when such conclusions would have been as much a surprise to me as they will be to many of my Assyriological colleagues, but I have been prepared for them by a study of the laws of Khammurabi. I had expected to find points of similarity and dependence between the laws of the great Babylonian legislator and those of the Pentateuch, and numerous German publications had assured me that such was the case. But instead of this I can find little except difference and contrast; what has struck me has been, not the agreement, but the unlikeness between the Codes of Babylonia and Moses—the one is addressed to the civilized citizens of a settled monarchy, the other to nomad tribes.

Professor Wilson's examination of the lexicon has shown that this unlikeness extends through all the departments of religious and social life. Even the words for 'priest' are not the same in Hebrew and Assyrian, nor is there a דָּבָר, 'or pilgrim festival, among the Babylonians, a word and a thing so familiar to the Hebrews and the Arabs.' Where resemblances in detail have been pointed out between Babylonia and Israel, they sometimes prove to have been really between Israel and the alien Western Semites who were settled in Babylonia and its neighbourhood. That is notably the case with the name Yahum-ilu or Joel, which I was the first to notice in the pages of this periodical, and which, so far as I can see, has nothing to do with names compounded with Yapi, as has recently been maintained.

On the other hand, Professor Wilson's philological evidence must not be pressed too far. Hebrew was 'the language of Canaan,' and for centuries Canaan was permeated with Babylonian influence and culture. The earlier chapters of Genesis look back to the banks of the Euphrates; the Sabbath, in both name and institution, was of Babylonian origin, however special and peculiar may have been its development in Israel, and there was much in the Hebrew ritual and theological conceptions which can be traced to a Babylonian source. With all this, however, the contrast and dissimilarity between Israel and the great centre of Western Asiatic civilization is truly astonishing; the fundamental ideas may be the

same, but among the Hebrews they have not only been worked out on different lines, but not unfrequently in what can be explained only as a spirit of intentional opposition.

The immense masses of literature which are being furnished by the libraries of Babylonia are at length providing us with the means of comparison necessary for placing the study of the Pentateuch and of Old Testament history on a scientific footing. What the contract tablets have done for the age of the Captivity, and the Tel el-Amarna tablets for that of Moses, thousands of early Babylonian documents are now doing for that of Abraham. It is to the contracts and other legal documents of that age that we must look to illustrate and supplement the Code of Khammurabi, and scholars will therefore welcome a useful little book just published by Dr. S. Daiches: *Altbabylonische Rechtsurkunden aus der Zeit der Hammurabi-Dynastie* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1903). The tablets with which it deals are full of instruction. We find women buying and selling like men; indeed, most of the sellers mentioned in the contracts translated by Dr. Daiches are not men but women. On the other hand, the majority of the slaves seem to have been female, perhaps on account of their slighter monetary value, the female slave fetching on an average not more than about five shekels, while the male slave was worth half a mina or thirty shekels. Hired servants were exclusively men. Slaves, however, were clearly not very numerous in the Babylonia of the Abrahamic period, and we learn from the laws of Khammurabi that children of a slave by a free man became free themselves, along with their mother, after their father's death. Even the children of a male slave by a free woman had a right to freedom.

Not the least interesting part of the contracts are the numerous West-Semitic names contained in them. They prove how large a portion of the population of Babylonia must have consisted of Western Semites in the time of a dynasty which was itself West-Semitic; and they also prove that these Western Semites enjoyed all the rights and privileges of the native Babylonians. Among the names we find Yatarum, the biblical Jethro; Yabuzatum, the feminine of Jebus; Amurum, 'the Amorite'; and Yapium, which, as Dr. Daiches remarks, prevents us from seeing the Hebrew Yahweh in the first element of Yapi-ilu. One of the characteristics

of these West-Semitic names is to replace the special name of the tribal or national god by *ilu*, 'the god,' in the second half of a compound, and by Samu or Sumu, the biblical Shem, 'the Name,' in the first half of the compound. Thus the first two kings of Khammurabi's dynasty were Samu-ilu, 'the Name is god,' and Sumu-la-ilu. The significance of the latter name is not clear; Professor Hommel makes it: 'Is Sumu not a god?' which is not very satisfactory. Dr. Daiches proposes to read Sumu-lail, where *lail* would be a participle, but this too has its difficulties.

Another point of interest in the contracts is the evidence they afford that the legal Sumerian terms found in them were not used ideographically, but had been adopted by the Semites like Latin and French terms in our own law. Thus the Sumerian *muni*, 'his name,' is in one place provided with the

Semitic mimimation *im*, showing that it was pronounced as a single Semitic word *munim*, and elsewhere we have the Sumerian verb, *gagá*, interchanging with *gigi*. The number of Semitized Sumerian words in Assyrian has long since made it clear that the Babylonian vocabulary was as much a mixed one as that of modern Egyptian Arabic, and the long contact of the Western Semites with Babylonia, not to speak of the fact that Canaan was once a province of the Babylonian Empire, would incline us to expect that such borrowings have made their way also into what we call Hebrew. Hence it is not surprising that the name by which the 'city' was known in Canaan should have been of Sumerian origin, the Hebrew עִיר being the Babylonian *uru*, which itself is borrowed from the Sumerian *eri*.

A. H. SAYCE.

Queen's College, Oxford.

The Invitation to the Thirsty.

BY THE REV JAMES E. SOMERVILLE, B.D., MENTONE.

THE beautiful invitation uttered by the Lord in the court of the temple on the occasion of His visit to Jerusalem, at the Feast of Tabernacles,¹ has been well called the grandest of all the utterances of Jesus. The offer of the living water which He had made to the solitary Samaritan at the well, near the beginning of His ministry, is now, near the close of His ministry, thrown open to the thronging crowds of Jewish worshippers in the temple. The invitation to the 'weary and heavy laden' is recorded by St. Matthew alone. To St. John we are indebted for preserving this precious word addressed to the thirsty of every age and clime.

Every one must be conscious of embarrassment, however, in the effort to understand these verses. For, in the first place, in our translation there is an awkward change of subject in the middle. And then there are the words, 'he that believeth on me, as saith the scripture, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water.' Where in the Old Testament is such a saying to be found? In vain is it searched for. Some have imagined that the words have somehow dropped out of the book, and been lost. Others less extravagant would read 'he that believeth as the scripture said,' and understand the

meaning to be that the faith must be conformable with Scripture. The great majority of interpreters, however, understand the words to mean that out of the believer flow rivers of living water. The difficulty is that no passage in the Old Testament says such a thing, or anything like it. Commentators refer to a number of passages where water is spoken about, and they try to twist them into some such meaning. But the effort is pitiful. Meyer says 'there is no exactly corresponding passage in Scripture, it is merely a free quotation, harmonizing in thought with various passages, especially Is 44³ 55¹ 58¹¹ (compare also Ezk 47¹ Zec 13¹ 14⁸). All I have to say is, if that is exegesis, alas for those who are dependent on exegetes. To attempt to find in any of these passages or all combined a prediction that out of the believer in Christ shall flow rivers of living water is to attempt the impossible, and to play fast and loose with the word of God. Perhaps someone will suggest Is 58¹¹, the promise to the kind and charitable as a solution, where it is said, 'Thou shalt be like a watered garden, and like a spring of water whose waters fail not.' But that verse says the very opposite. A watered garden does not send out water, but retains the water for its own needs. And if the thought be supposed

¹ Jn 7³⁷⁻³⁸.

to hark back to the rivers of the garden of Eden, we have only to be reminded that the four rivers did not run out of the garden, but branched up from it to their sources.

Let us be perfectly frank and honest. The Scriptures never say that out of the believer shall flow rivers of living water. I make bold to say they never could say such a thing. Man is not and never can be a source of supply of living water. Man cannot even be a reservoir. There is but one source of living water. 'With thee is the fountain of life,' says Psalm 36, and our metrical rendering is not wrong when it says—

Because of life the fountain pure
Remains alone with thee.

When Jesus said to the woman of Samaria, 'The water that I shall give him shall be in him a well of water springing up to everlasting life,' He did not mean that he who partook would be able to supply others, but that he himself should have an unfailing source of supply: 'he shall never thirst.' It is quite true that when a man becomes a believer, the Lord uses him to be a blessing to others. Peter, on the day of Pentecost, having received the fulness of the Spirit, was the means of the conversion of 3000, but he did not impart to them the living water. He did not draw them to himself. His whole object, then and ever, was to point away from himself to Christ, whom they had crucified, but from whom they also should receive the Holy Ghost, if they repented. Like Paul and all the other apostles he could say, 'We preach not ourselves, but Jesus Christ the Lord.' It is one thing to be a fisher of men, a very different thing to be a source of living water.

How then are we to read the verses, and what is the meaning of our Lord's words? False punctuation has led to misreading of the words, to wrong interpretation, and to very serious doctrinal error. At the end of v.⁸⁷ a period has been placed. Instead of that, put a comma, and then read *ἐάν τις διψᾷ ἐρχέσθω πρὸς με καὶ πινέτω ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμέ*, 'If any man thirst, let him come unto me, and let him drink that believeth in me,' then put the period, and continue *Καθὼς εἶπεν ἡ γραφή, ποταμοὶ ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας αὐτοῦ ῥέουσιν ὕδατος ζῶντος*, 'As saith the scripture, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water.' Who is the subject? It is Christ. He is speaking about Himself, the only source whence living water can be obtained. Within seven words twice he says Me.

Alford declaims against our rendering because of its unexampled harshness. That is a matter of opinion. It is no more harsh than 'He that believeth in me, out of him shall flow.' It is not taste we are concerned with, but truth. Bengel calls it a plausible rendering, though he turns from it; but in the end he makes *αὐτοῦ* to mean Messiah, as indeed does Alford before he is done, thus giving up the case. Stier strongly maintains the rendering we have given.

Jesus could not well have said, 'Out of me, as saith the scripture.' He is speaking of the Promised One, and though there is no actual verse which says that out of the Promised One shall flow rivers of living water, yet the symbolism of the Old Testament foreshadows it. Jesus may have had in his mind the temple described by Ezekiel from which issued the streams of water which made everything live to which they came. There can be little doubt, however, that the great invitation took its form from the ceremony of the 'pouring out of water' drawn from the pool of Siloam, which took place daily at the temple during the Feast of Tabernacles; and which, being omitted the last day of the feast, gave special occasion for the invitation of Jesus. The ceremony was intended to commemorate the miraculous supply of water from the rock in the wilderness. Jesus here seems to intimate that that rock symbolized Himself. Paul says in so many words, 'that rock was Christ.' The language of the LXX in Ex 17⁶ is *παράξει τὴν πέτραν, καὶ ἐξελεύσεται ἐξ αὐτῆς ὕδωρ, καὶ πίεται ὁ λαός*. The first part of the phrase corresponds with *ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας αὐτοῦ*, while the second part resembles the clause, *πινέτω ὁ πιστεύων*. The interpretation that has been given seems to receive confirmation from the words of v.⁸⁹. There John says, 'this spake he of the Spirit, that they that believed on him were to receive.' Nothing is suggested about men giving out the Spirit or anything corresponding to the water. In fact the explanation of the evangelist negatives altogether the common interpretation.

Read as we do it, the whole passage is homogeneous and speaks about one subject. The sense is not broken by an extraneous idea obtruded, regarding something we are to become. The passage speaks only about Christ and what He bestows on us.

It may be objected that by our reading of the passage a difference is made between believing and drinking, which are usually only different ways

of stating the same thing. But the Lord seems expressly to indicate a difference. Coming to Him and believing are identical, but here drinking seems to imply something more than believing. Let him that believes drink. That signifies a very personal appropriation of the Saviour and a continual doing of that. Is not this just the point

where so many Christian lives fail? And does it not give the explanation of the sapless, powerless lives of many who have come to Christ and believe in Him? They do not drink of the living fountain from day to day, but are satisfied to know they have come and have believed in Christ.

At the Literary Table.

THE FALL AND ORIGINAL SIN.

Cambridge University Press. 9s. net.

WHEN Mr. F. R. Tennant published his Hulsean Lectures last year he created a theological sensation. For the Fall of Man is understood to be the foundation of all our theology, and Mr. Tennant seemed to deny it. At least if he did not deny the fact of the Fall he seemed to deny its doctrine, and especially the doctrine of Original Sin that comes out of it. Men challenged his position. He knew they would challenge it. He was already preparing an answer. He told them that if they would wait he would show them the sources and development of the doctrines of the Fall and Original Sin. He has made good his promise in the present volume.

Apart from its orthodoxy or otherwise (and that is really a minor matter), it is a book of which any University might be proud. Its range of knowledge is astonishing. Mr. Tennant disclaims the authority of a specialist in all these branches of study, or even in any of them. But it takes a scholar to use other men's scholarship. Mr. Tennant has not only done that, but he has made men feel that he was worth the best they could do for him privately, and his book is enriched with much learning not found as yet in any book.

What has Mr. Tennant to say of the Pauline doctrine of Original Sin? That is the point of more immediate interest to us. It is too large a question to answer in a review, but this short paragraph will show the line he takes:—

'There is no doubt that St. Paul's mind was deeply influenced by his Rabbinical training. His attitude towards the Old Testament Scriptures, his ideas of the nature of their inspiration, his method of using them for proofs and of interpreting them, his resort to allegory and haggada, all reveal the

apostle's early environment. And, more than this, it is beyond doubt that he retained a considerable amount of Jewish, as distinguished from Old Testament, theology. His ideas, for instance, of the first man, the temptation of Eve, the Fall and its results, were derived, as will presently be seen, from the Jewish schools.'

HISTORY OF THE CHURCH AND STATE IN NORWAY.

Constable. 12s. 6d. net.

Mr. T. B. Willson's book is both more and less than its title promises. It is less, inasmuch as it begins with the tenth century and ends with the sixteenth. But it is also more, and much more, because it is not merely a history of the relation between the Church and the State, but of the whole religious life of the Norwegian people. The reason for the title is that Church and State had more to do with one another in Norway than in any other country in Europe.

It is a history of Christianity in Norway before the Reformation. A few pages are occupied with the religion of the country before Christianity came, but the story opens in earnest with Haakon the Good and the first public practice of the gospel there. Haakon lapsed and died a heathen, and Mr. Willson tells the touching story of his death well. Then comes the heathen reaction under Haakon Jarl, whereupon we pass to the founding of the Norwegian Church under Olaf Trygvesson, and the triumph of the White Christ.

Mr. Willson's book is popular. That is to say, the author makes most of the most striking episodes, has the command of a picturesque English style, and does not worry his readers with footnotes. The names in the book are not just 'familiar as household words'; on the whole it is better to

practise a little before reading the book aloud. But Mr. Willson has a masterly way of managing even such unmanageable spelling, and we get familiar and friendly with Olaf Engelbrektsson, Sverre Sigurdsson, and the like. We almost forget that we have been living among strangers until we suddenly strike upon Margaret the Maid of Norway, and the thoughts she stirs of home, sweet home.

THE EARLY HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE.

Methuen. 10s. 6d.

'In an age when other than the Catholic interpretations of the gospel and of the Person of Christ are put forward and find favour in unexpected quarters, much heart-searching and laborious inquiry may be saved by the knowledge that similar or identical explanations were offered and ably advocated centuries ago; that they were tried, not only by intellectual but also by moral tests, and that the experience of life rejected them as inadequate or positively false. The semi-conscious Ebionism and the semi-conscious Docetism, for example, of much professedly Christian thought to-day may recognize itself in many an ancient "heresy," and reconsider its position.'

That use Mr. Bethune-Baker himself sees in his book. But it has other uses than that. It is an introduction to Theology. It will give one, probably many a one, for the first time in life, an idea of what Theology is. Its great purpose is to show us where our theology has come from, and how it has come. But the more important matter is to know what theology is and what is the use of it, and this we say Mr. Bethune-Baker's book will do better than any book we can think of. For he is a man of rare courage, being so loyal to the Catholic Creeds and the Church. Christian doctrines are seen in his book as 'human attempts to interpret human experiences, the unique personality of Jesus of Nazareth being supreme among those human experiences.' Those are his own words in expressing his point of view. His courage in uttering them is seen not only in overcoming the fear of being charged with disloyalty to the Church, but more than that in deliberately refusing to claim for Christian doctrine an authority which it does not possess.

The editor of Methuen's 'Manuals of Christian

Doctrine' made a great hit when he secured Mr. Bethune-Baker for this volume. Cambridge men will say that he knows the history of early Christian doctrine better than any of them. Other men when they read this book will say that no man, Cambridge or other, could have done the work better. Let us not seem to exaggerate, but let us not be afraid to say that it opens a new era in the writing of Theology. It is doubtful if we shall see any more 'Systematic Theology' written. This is Theology, not as system but as life; and if Theology is not that, it is nothing.

That we may aid somewhat in the circulation of the book let us add that it is written for beginners, and that it does not even demand a knowledge of the German language.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF AUGUSTE COMTE.

Sonnenschein. 10s. 6d.

The philosophy of Auguste Comte has not been accepted in this country. It has had one ardent, powerful, and persistent champion. But not even the genius of Mr. Frederic Harrison has gained it popularity. So closely has it been identified with that single name that the very poverty of its reception has been made the more conspicuous by Mr. Harrison's advocacy. Every new year he makes his address on Positivism, and the ordinary Englishman waits till the new year comes round again to be reminded that the Positive Philosophy is alive.

Mr. Harrison believes that the failure of the Philosophy of Auguste Comte is due to ignorance. And it must be admitted that the average Englishman is a little ignorant. Still, Mr. Harrison has surpassing gifts of speech; it is strange that in all these years he has not caught the average Englishman's ear. What he has failed to effect himself he now hopes may be done by another. He has written an Introduction to the English translation of Professor Lévy-Bruhl's exposition. Professor Lévy-Bruhl is not a Positivist, but Mr. Harrison is perfectly satisfied with his exposition of the Positive Philosophy. He thanks him for it. He welcomes the book as 'fair, learned, and instructive,' as 'a masterly study of a comprehensive subject,' and he hopes that now at last the average Englishman will discover what Positivism is and believe in it.

It is a masterly study, as Mr. Harrison says, and it is well translated. Whether the Positive Philo-

sophy is to win its way in our land or not, we ought to be ashamed of our ignorance of it. The shame will be greater now than ever. Professor Lévy-Bruhl has not been able to remove all the difficulties out of our way, nor even all the contradictions out of the system, but he has made a fair comprehension of this subject possible and even a pleasure.

A MANUAL OF MYSTICAL THEOLOGY.

R. & T. Washbourne. 7s. 6d. net.

The expression 'Mystical Theology' as used by the Rev. Arthur Devine, Passionist, in this book, does not differ from the shorter title 'Mysticism' as used by others, unless it be that 'Mysticism' with others is usually an outsider's attempt to estimate an historical movement of which they themselves are no part, whereas Mr. Devine is himself a mystic, and his manual is meant, not to tell us what mysticism is, but to give us rules for the attainment of it.

Yet he does tell us what Mysticism is. It is Contemplation. At least Contemplation is the chief operation of the mystical life, and 'all other favours in that life may be reduced to this.' Mr. Devine prefers the title Contemplation. He is content with it. If there is anything in Mysticism which is not in Contemplation, he is not interested in it.

But what is Contemplation? Contemplation means, first, that there be the simple intuition of some divine truth; secondly, that the intuition be of such clearness as to excite admiration in the mind; thirdly, that the intuition be united with a pleasing affection towards those objects which the soul admires. Or, to put it all into a definition, the definition of the Rev. F. V. Voss, 'Mystical contemplation is the elevation of the mind to God and to divine things, joined with an admiring and loving intuition of the same divine things.' Or, to put it into a plainer definition still, a definition more after Mr. Devine's own mind, the definition of the Rev. F. C. Doyle: 'Contemplative Prayer is like all prayer, in that it is an uplifting of the mind and heart to God. It differs from meditation in that it is made without reasoning, without the use of sensible images, without the *perceptible* use of the internal senses; but by a pure, quiet, simple operation of the mind which we call *intuition*. It is the outcome of meditation.'

Mr. Devine's book is not only a manual, it is *the* manual of Mystical Theology. It is clear, it is comprehensive, it is enthusiastic.

DID JESUS LIVE 100 B.C.?

Theosophical Publication Society. 9s. net.

The question is not a fool's question. It is serious, and Mr. G. R. S. Mead, B.A., M.R.A.S., takes it seriously. Says Neubauer (*Med. Jewish Chronicles*, 183, 273), 'The Jewish history-writers say that Joshua ben-Perachiah was the teacher of Jeschu ha-Notzri, according to which the latter lived in the days of king Jannai; the history-writers of the other nations, however, say that he was born in the days of Herod, and was hanged in the days of his son, Archelaus. This is a great difference, a difference of more than 110 years.' Thus the Christians say that Jesus of Nazareth was born in the days of Herod, but the Jews assert that he was born about 100 years before that. Which is right? Mr. Mead solemnly and seriously investigates the question through 440 octavo pages.

Is he so partial to the Jews then? Not at all. He cares little for Christians as such; he probably cares less for Jews. His interest in the question is of another kind. Certain friends of his have told him that they know for certain that Jesus of Nazareth was born 100 B.C. They are not Jews. They have no interest in deceiving him. They are of various nationalities. They differ in person, in speech, in sex, in creed—well, no, not in creed, for they are all theosophists. They agree really in these two points, they are all theosophists, and they are all sure that Jesus was born 100 B.C.

So Mr. Mead investigates the question, as we have said, and the conclusion he comes to is that no conclusion is possible on the subject. The crux of the controversy is with the name of Pilate. But Mr. Mead concludes that there is as much to say against Pilate's having anything to do with the death of Christ as for it.

PAGAN CHRISTS.

Watts & Co.

Mr. John M. Robertson is the 'great hope' of the Rationalist party to-day. He has scholarship, though he spreads it over too many subjects. He is a prolific writer. He has a good command of telling phrases. And he is absolutely

untouched by respect for other people's religious opinions.

Mr. Robertson has written a new book. It is published by Messrs. Watts for the Rationalist Press Association. Its title is *Pagan Christs*. It covers the whole ground of Comparative Religion, and has special chapters on Mithraism and on the Religions of Ancient America. Now there is no department of human study in which dogmatism is more out of place at present than in Comparative Religion. But Mr. Robertson criticises such lifelong students of the subject as Frazer and Jevons, and of their most cherished opinions says loftily, 'It will really not do.'

Mr. Robertson does not believe in Jesus. He does not believe in His existence. Professor Schmiedel thinks there are nine 'entirely credible' texts in the Gospels, and that upon these nine a life of Jesus may be constructed. Mr. Robertson is very merry over the nine. 'One thinks,' he says, 'of Mr. Meredith's figure of the hosts upon hosts of changing waves, whose achievement is only—

To throw that thin white line upon the shore.

And then, "with due care and respect," he enumerates "the forlorn handful of unwounded survivors."

He does not believe in their survival. Nor if they do survive will they prove the historical existence of Jesus. For, all that Dr. Schmiedel claims for his unwounded nine is that they are 'entirely credible.' But, says Mr. Robertson, to be 'entirely credible' is only to be possible, and to be possible can never be demonstrably historical. The nine texts, says Dr. Schmiedel, prove that 'He really did exist.' Mr. Robertson absolutely denies that. And on this point he is prepared to 'stake the whole dispute as to the actuality of the Gospel Jesus.'

Mr. Robertson knows no scruples. He calls the evangelists forgers; and though Dr. Schmiedel has been very serviceable to him, he tears his conclusions to tatters. Historical! he says; you might as well say that Hercules would be historical in spite of his twelve impossible 'Labours,' if only the ancients had ascribed ten reasonable sayings to him.

He has no difficulty in disposing of Professor Schmiedel. He has more difficulty in disposing of Jesus Christ. For when he has got rid of the

nine 'entirely credible' sayings, there remains the Church of Christ. 'On this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.' Professor Schmiedel would build the Church on nine sayings, choosing them because they were the expression of weakness or incompetency. Mr. Robertson alone can prevail against that. But the Church remains. The Church is actually in existence. And the Church goes back to Jesus Christ.

Mr. Robertson never faces that. He has much to say about Jesuism and the Jesuine cult. He introduces much mythological and other incredibly childish superstition. But he never accounts for the origin of the Church. He never explains how the Church first took its being, nor why up till now the gates of hell have *not* prevailed against it. The Church of Christ is Mr. Robertson's supreme aversion. It is also the refutation of all he writes.

Other Books of the Month.

THE WAGON AND THE STAR.

The volume with this audacious title seems to be nothing more and nothing less than a volume of young men's sermons. Now it is easier to preach to young men than to any other class. They have lost the intuition by which children detect the least false ring in the offer of the truth, and they have not gained the experience by which old men judge the preacher's very principles. It is so easy to preach to young men that very few preachers can do it. They fail by not being natural. They pass by the natural, which is the easy; and they strain after imaginative effects. Young men are not imaginative; they are actual, and they are nothing more.

Mr. Walter A. Mursell is a preacher to young men. His publisher, Mr. Gardner of Paisley, has printed the book in a novel type, which is so black and so small that it dazzles the eye. But the book will outlive that. The price is 2s. 6d. net.

HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY.

Messrs. Ginn & Company of Boston and London are the publishers of this new class-book of the History of Philosophy. Its author is William Turner, S.T.D. Why is the book published, and

for what is it worth our notice? It is worth our notice for its exposition of Scholasticism. Dr. Turner believes, and we all agree with him, that in the ordinary History of Philosophy, Scholasticism is denied its rights. It is dismissed in a paragraph or it is discussed in terms of Hegelianism. Dr. Turner divides his manual into three parts. The first part deals with Ancient Philosophy. That occupies 210 pages. The second part deals with the Philosophy of the Christian Era. That is separated into Patristic Philosophy, occupying 20 pages; Scholastic Philosophy occupying 180 pages; and Modern Philosophy occupying 240 pages. Thus we see that for the first time in a school book, Scholasticism gets space. It also gets justice. Dr. Turner is an ardent student of the schoolmen. He believes in them; he can write about them with conviction. The subject, supposed vulgarly to be the driest on earth, is alive with human interest; our keenest modern problems run back to it. For its treatment of the Scholastic Philosophy Dr. Turner's book is noteworthy. But it is written and published as a Student's Manual of Philosophy. And it is successful. There is the swift seizing of the essential throughout; its expression also in clear self-effacing language.

THE MEN OF THE BEATITUDES.

An author who can strike out a good title like this—for the volume is simply an exposition of the Sermon on the Mount—has won half his battle. But the Rev. Albert J. Southouse has other things that arrest besides his title. He has a way of throwing off the incubus of the traditional language of the pulpit, and yet he never descends to the diction of the street. He arrests by using always the best modern word. He finds no difficulty in interpreting the Sermon on the Mount in language that is intelligible to the readers of our newspapers (Hodder & Stoughton; 3s. 6d.).

THE CRIMSON BOOK.

It is the personal element that is wanting in the preaching of to-day. Not the preaching of the preacher himself. There is enough of that. But the preaching of faith as nothing if not the establishment of a personal relationship between the sinner and his Saviour. Our fathers preached from the Song of Solomon. Murray M'Cheyne's Pulpit Bible lies in the vestry of the M'Cheyne Memorial Church, Dundee. The one book of the Bible in

it that is well thumbed is the Song of Solomon. 'My Beloved is mine, and I am His.' We never call Christ our Beloved now. Only an occasional Methodist does. The Rev. Dinsdale T. Young does. And that is the strength and victory of his preaching, and of the volume of sermons which he has just published under the title of *The Crimson Book* (Hodder & Stoughton; 3s. 6d.).

OUR DIVINE SHEPHERD.

Dr. W. H. Gray of Edinburgh has been a preacher to children for nearly sixty years. Here is a volume of his sermons (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s.). They are neither short nor scrappy. A good strong Bible subject is chosen, doctrine is mixed with reproof, and the children feel proud of having had a whole service to themselves, even though it cost them something to receive it all. There is theology, but it is not rigid. Dr. Gray rejoices that the Fatherhood of God and the Redemption of the whole world are now no longer articles of heterodoxy in the Church of Scotland. He preaches these doctrines, and he believes that the children are the better for that.

THE CRISES OF THE CHRIST.

It is impossible to admire the title of Dr. Campbell Morgan's new book (Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d.). It is impossible to admire its appearance. It is impossible to admire itself. Everything seems to have been done, and it is evidently the author's own doing, to show that the gospel it contains is medicine, and that the medicine is very nasty to take. To begin at the end: you never saw so unattractive a subject-index, at least you never saw one so wilfully unattractive. Here are two of its entries—

HAPPEN,	
If no resurrection, what did	337
INVESTITURE,	
with a name, Jesus'	354 f.

Whole hymns are quoted throughout the book, to which there is a separate index giving the first line, the author's name, and the page. But in spite of all its unattractiveness, the author has such a rejoicing confidence in his own interpretations that he compels us to listen to him, and gives us something to think about. He tortures us and the English language in the process,—the title of the very first chapter is, 'Man distanced from God by sin,'—but he has a personality; he impresses him-

self upon us, and after all we have suffered from his book, when next he preaches in London we shall go to hear him. —

THE HERITAGE OF YOUTH.

This pretty volume tells its tale in its title. Mr. David Watson has discovered his gift. He can speak to young men and women. His publishers have discovered him, and given him the benefit of their most artistic binding (Hodder & Stoughton; 3s. 6d.). Mr. Watson knows the topics to handle. Burns is one of them, and Burns never fails. It is more difficult to make him profitable. Mr. Watson's way is to show what Burns thought of himself. —

THE REPRESENTATIVE MEN OF THE BIBLE.

So many men have to write sermons, and it is so easy to write sermons on the biographies in the Bible, that there is no end to the books that are published dealing with Scripture characters. But everybody will admit that Dr. George Matheson has the right to publish a book on any subject. On *The Representative Men of the Bible* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s.) he is just as original and as edifying as on any other subject.

This is the second volume. It goes from Ishmael to Daniel. Again, every man is characterized by one strong epithet — Lot the lingerer, Melchisedek the uncanonical, Aaron the vacillating, Caleb the explorer, Ezekiel the individualist. But again the error of making the character conform to the epithet is avoided.

It was a bold thing of Dr. Matheson to start this series just when his neighbour over the way, Dr. Alexander Whyte, was completing his series of volumes on *Bible Characters*. But Dr. Matheson knew that he was not Dr. Whyte, nor is Dr. Whyte Dr. Matheson. They neither contradict nor supplement one another. They stand apart. For the Bible is big enough for both. We should read both. Intellectually and spiritually we will be much benefited by reading both. But when we preach on the men of the Bible, we should be neither Dr. Matheson nor Dr. Whyte. The Bible is big enough for us all. —

THE CITIZEN'S LIBRARY.

Professor Ely of Wisconsin is the editor, and Messrs. Macmillan are the publishers of 'The

Citizen's Library.' The sixteenth volume has just been published, and ten more volumes are announced. It is strange that the series has not got introduced into this country. Its subjects are timely, and if we may judge by the volume before us, there is a combination of scientific accuracy and literary grace which ought to secure for them a wide acceptance. The volume before us is entitled *Studies in the Evolution of Industrial Society*. Professor Ely himself is the author. It is hard to say whether the book is better suited for the parlour or the study. It is thorough enough to give the student a good working knowledge of the subject, and yet those who have no need to 'get up' the subject may pass a very agreeable hour with it. Recent events have made it known to all the world that the Englishman is an infant in Economics. A course of 'The Citizen's Library' might make something of a man of him. —

THE BIBLE IN THE BATTLEFIELD.

The most touching thing in Mr. Kipling's new volume of poems is his tribute to the nurses who fell in the Boer War. The prose story of it, with much else, is given in a book with the title of *The Bible in the Battlefield*, written by F. C. Vernon-Harcourt, and published by Messrs. Marshall Brothers at 3s. 6d. net. The book is not literature. The author explains that literature cannot be written on board a crowded troopship in a Biscayan gale; or under tropic skies, a burning sun overhead, and stifling heat all around; or in the heat of bitter and protracted battle. But it is excellent newspaper correspondence, and it glorifies the Word of God. —

THE FINGER OF GOD.

We fear there is no denying it that the attitude of the average man of science to-day towards the miracles of the Bible is one of contempt. We believe, on the other hand, that there is no part of the Bible which carries more meaning to the believer in Christ. The man of science and the believer should take note, each of the other's attitude. Who will bring them together? The Rev. T. H. Wright has endeavoured to do it. Under the title of *The Finger of God* (Melrose; 3s. 6d. net) he has published a volume of 'Studies and Suggestions in the Miracles of Jesus.' He is thoroughly aware of the attitude of the modern man of science to the miracles of our Lord. He

is not a little concerned about it. He is also keenly sensitive to the spiritual value of the miracles. He believes it is possible to bring science and devotion together. And he seems to be well furnished for doing it. We cannot discuss the book in detail, but we may say that taken as a whole, it leaves upon one the impression that the time is yet far distant when the miracles of the Gospels will be discovered to be of no religious or scientific value.

LANCELOT ANDREWES' PRECES PRIVATAE.

The Rev. F. E. Brightman, M.A., Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, and Canon of Lincoln, has prepared, and Messrs. Methuen have published, an edition of Bishop Andrewes' Private Prayers, which supersedes all other editions. The book is a wonderful record of scholarship, patience, and love for the literature of devotion. The manuscript collation, the translation, the arrangement, the marginal notes, the extended notes at the end, the introduction—everything is the best of its kind, and a delight. To the introduction Canon Brightman adds a few notes on the use and influence of the *Preces*. He ends in this way: 'In the last few years they have been edited, not only by Mr. Medd, but also by Mr. Veale, whose introduction and notes are sufficient to show that he belongs to a school not in sympathy with that of Andrewes, and by Dr. Alexander Whyte of the Free Church of Scotland. And at the same time it is noticeable and characteristic that it is the "evangelicals" of the English Church who are most reserved in their appreciation, and most inclined to criticise in detail what they approve in general. Edward Bickersteth and Mr. Veale find it necessary to make qualifications, while Dr. Whyte is content to be enthusiastic.'

THE APOSTLE PAUL.

Dr. Whyte of Edinburgh has published six volumes of *Bible Characters*. In one of the volumes sixteen chapters are concerned with St. Paul. These sixteen chapters Dr. Whyte has gathered out, added five sermons on Pauline texts, and an appreciation of Walter Marshall, 'the most Pauline of Divines,' and so given us a new book (Oliphant; 3s. 6d.), as characteristic of Dr. Whyte as anything you will find, and as good for your spiritual nourishment and growth in grace.

BONNIE DUNDEE.

The traveller who enters Dundee at the Tay Bridge station is puzzled to account for that description of the city, which has been carried all over the world in the title of the popular song, 'Bonnie Dundee.' The traveller has made two mistakes. The one is to fancy that Dundee can be seen from the Tay Bridge station; the other, that the song has to do with the city. Seen from 'the other side of the water,' Dundee is well worthy of the title 'Bonnie Dundee'; but it was Viscount Dundee, the man and not the city, who inspired the popular song.

His friends called him 'Bonnie Dundee.' His enemies called him 'Bloody Claverhouse.' And in spite of the proverb about a nation's songs, 'Bloody Claverhouse' is the name by which he has been popularly known these two centuries. He now figures among the Famous Scots (Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier; 1s. 6d. net). Forty Scots were found famous and recorded before the publishers ventured upon 'Clavers.' But having decided to have him at last, they decided to show him famous. It is the day of whitewash; one more will scarcely be remarked after the ways of modern writers with Nero and kindred. But it is doubtful if whitewashing does much for any man. It is doubtful, after all that Mr. Louis A. Barbé has done, if the 'Bloody Claverhouse' of the past will be anything but 'Bloody Claverhouse' still. For a man's reputation does not depend upon disputable evidence. The biographers may contradict one another in some details, but the judgment of a man's own day is rarely reversed by posterity.

EVANGELISTS OF ART.

Of all the books of the month this is the book that has attracted us most. It contains reproductions of eight famous modern pictures; each picture is connected with a text of Scripture; and text and picture together are then made the topic of a beautiful sermon to children. The author is the Rev. James Patrick, B.D., B.Sc., of Burntisland. So far as we know, it is Mr. Patrick's first publication. It is enough to give him a name as a true children's preacher, and that is no small distinction. But more than that, it will give him a name as a true artist, with a rare feeling for the appropriate word; and still more as a lover of the Truth itself,

not merely in his loyal adherence to fact, but in the uplifting of fact into the light and transfiguration of the Spirit. The book is published by Messrs. Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier at the modest price of 2s. 6d. net. It is a quarto of most attractive finish.

THE MYSTERIES OF MITHRA.

Professor Franz Cumont of the University of Ghent is the greatest living authority on Mithraism. He gained that position at a bound. He gained it by the issue of that book of which a translation has just been made into English, and sent out by the Open Court Publishing Company of Chicago (6s. 6d. net).

The translation is made from the Second French edition. With its additional illustrations it constitutes a new edition, so that within three years three editions of the book have appeared. The subject is one of extraordinary difficulty—for the accounts which we have of the worship of Mithra are the accounts of bitter enemies. It had not yet dawned upon Christianity, or rather Christianity had forgotten, that it is the duty of a Christian to represent the opinions of an enemy truthfully. Now Mithra was looked upon by the early Christians as the most deadly foe that Christianity would ever have to encounter. It was a question for a long time whether Mithraism or Christianity would rule the world. It was clearly seen that the one could rule only by destroying the other. So Professor Cumont has had to sift the truth out of universal misrepresentation. He has been immensely aided by the monumental discoveries of recent years. It is not too much to say that he has added a chapter to the history of religion.

A YOUNG MAN'S QUESTIONS.

Robert E. Speer is the Frederick A. Atkins of America. The initiated will understand. While Mr. Atkins includes young women in his sphere of interest, Mr. Speer extends his interest to the whole field of missions; but the centre of interest with both is young men. This is Mr. Speer's latest volume. He answers in it a number of questions which young men are supposed to ask—Shall I join the Church? Shall I drink? Shall I smoke? Is it wrong to bet? and the like. When young men ask these questions it is not difficult to answer them. The trouble is that they do these things without asking. But Mr. Speer

takes them on their soft side, as it were, and gives them credit for having asked. For he has a keen sense of the difficulty of driving young men, and of the ease with which they are led. Principle and practice have also shown him how to steer between the Scylla of laxity and the Charybdis of restraint. His book is published by the Fleming H. Revell Company (2s. 6d. net).

THE TEACHINGS OF JESUS CONCERNING WEALTH.

Mr. Gerald D. Heuver says that this volume (which is published by the Fleming H. Revell Company; 3s. net) is part of a thesis which he submitted to the University of Chicago for the degree of Ph.D. He must have got the degree, though he does not add it to his name on the preface. For no self-respecting Faculty would reject a thesis that is so original as this, so sound, and on so modern and momentous a subject. We shall never understand the teachings of Jesus concerning wealth. Dr. Heuver sees that. For the teachings of Jesus can be understood only when the mind of Christ is fully formed in us, only when we have attained to that 'glory' of which 'Christ in us' is the hope. But we can be ever trying to understand them. And Dr. Heuver will help us. He is more than he promises. He surveys for us the whole economic conditions of Palestine in our Lord's day. And he is watchful of the little things as well as alive to the great. 'One incident in the story of the Good Samaritan,' he says, 'should not be overlooked. It has often escaped the interpreter. It is that the Samaritan did not give the money to the sufferer, but to the keeper of the inn. And this suggests the important truth, that help for the needy can often be more wisely bestowed when given indirectly than directly, as when it is given to institutions which are founded for helping them.'

META-CHRISTIANITY.

'Meta-Christianity' is an extraordinary title for an extraordinary book. Those who know Mr. H. Croft Hiller's five volumes on *Heresies* may think that they know what to expect in the new book. But even they will be mistaken, for Mr. Croft Hiller has no more difficulty in denying his past self than a politician. What does Meta-Christianity mean? Mr. Croft Hiller explains its meaning as 'Spiritism Established, Religion Re-established,

Science Disestablished.' Now Spiritism includes Spiritualism, Religion is not the same as Christianity, and Science is Physical Science. Physical Science is an offence to Mr. Croft Hiller because it is not Metaphysics. To establish or disestablish Religion by chemical experiment is an absurdity which he exposes with the whole force of his copious gift of language. Again, Religion is not Christianity. It is not even the Christianity of Christ. For Christ's teaching, says Mr. Croft Hiller, was for the individual, and its sum may be stated in the single word, non-resistance. Hence Christ's teaching was foredoomed to failure as conditioning societies. In short, Religion, the Religion which Mr. Croft Hiller wants to re-establish, is Meta-Christianity. It stands to Christianity as metaphysics stands to physics. It will be better than Christianity, because, while Christianity expects every man to yield his coat on demand, in Meta-Christianity none will demand his coat. The book is published by the Walter Scott Publishing Company.

ALONG THE SHADOWED WAY.

The title is taken from a well-known hymn. The volume contains thirty-eight 'plain-spoken sermons.' The author is the Rev. J. George Gibson, F.R.G.S., and the publishers are Messrs. Skeffington (5s.). Plain-spoken sermons—that is quite accurate. And yet they will do more than feed the hungry preacher. They have occasional surprises of thought. What do you think of 'the Plea of the Devils' for a title and a subject? The text is Mt 8³¹, 'So the devils besought him, saying, If thou cast us out, suffer us to go away into the herd of swine.' They were such fools, those devils, for the swine just rushed down the steep place and were choked in the sea. But all devils are fools, and all persons in proportion as they approach devils in their character.

THE RISE AND FALL OF THE ANABAPTISTS.

Mr. E. Belfort Bax, having undertaken a study of the social side of the Reformation in Germany, has brought it to a conclusion by the issue of this volume on the Rise and Fall of the Anabaptists. The previous volumes were 'German Society at the Close of the Middle Ages,' and 'The Peasants' War in Germany.' The publishers are Messrs. Sonnenschein.

Mr. Bax is just the man to write the history of

Anabaptism. He is a historian, careful to seek and cautious to use the first-hand sources for his history; he has made himself acquainted with this very period as few others have done; and above all, he is in sympathy with his subject. Of course he sees absurdities in Anabaptism, and he condemns excesses in the Anabaptists. But he counts the subject a serious study for a historian, and he finds it part of that great industrial movement with which, wherever it manifests itself, he has the most undisguised sympathy. Anabaptism is 'the culminating effort of Mediæval Christian Communism,' and that is enough for Mr. Bax.

So his book is well written and very pleasant to read. He understands the men, he understands the movement, as very few historians have done or tried to do. Not only is his book pleasant to read, but it is a help towards that reversal of human judgment which one is so glad to make in the interests of the Church of Christ. These things were done in the name of Jesus, and Jesus is not so ashamed of them as we thought He was.

JESUS THE LAST GREAT INITIATE.

Many 'Lives' of Jesus have been written. This is another. This Life is different from any we have seen. It is probably different from any Life of Jesus that ever was written. It is the theosophist's Life. Jesus was an Essene. From the Essenes He learned what He afterwards taught. Now the Essenes were the direct successors of Samuel's Schools of the Prophets, and they were the guardians of an esoteric doctrine in which lay their secret and their strength. Jesus left His home in Nazareth on the death of His father Joseph, proceeded to the Essene community at Engaddi, and became the last great Initiate. His Life is told, the Gospels being critically followed, and He even rose from the dead. Not corporeally however. The resurrection of the body is 'one of the greatest stumbling-blocks of Christian dogma'; 'to the initiate the resurrection has a far different meaning. It refers to the doctrine of the ternary constitution of man. It signifies the purification and regeneration of the sidereal, ethereal, and fluidic body which is the very organism of the soul.'

The author of this latest Life of Jesus is M. Edouard Schuré; the translator is Mr. F. Rothwell, B.A. It is published by Mr. Philip Wellby at 2s. net.

THE RECOVERY AND RESTATEMENT OF THE GOSPEL.

'The purpose of the following pages is to show how the gospel of Jesus has become obscured during the course of its historical development, and that it is therefore necessary to go back to this in order to recover the gospel which He taught; and further, that inasmuch as the world's culture has radically changed during the centuries since Christianity received its first dogmatic expression, this recovered gospel needs restatement in terms of modern thought and life.'

Thus does Dr. L. D. Osborn let us into the secret of his book. It is published at the University of Chicago Press (\$1.50), and it has the marks of reverent freedom and thoroughness in scholarship which belong to most of the issues of that Press. Does any man want a footing for his faith? Does he want something to start with, an authority, however limited in range, that is really authoritative? Dr. Osborn wanted all that. He went to the New Testament and found it in the historical study of that book. He tells us what he found, sincerely and persuasively. It is one of the best books of real apologetic recently published.

Messrs. A. & C. Black have issued a new edition of Professor James Ward's Gifford Lectures on *Naturalism and Agnosticism* (2 vols. 18s. net). There are those (and we confess to be of their number) who count this the greatest of all the Gifford Lectures. It seems to have given us most. It seems sanest. It seems to be most comprehensive of truth, most unmerciful toward partiality and pretentiousness. It seems most in accordance with the mind of Christ. The new edition contains numerous corrections and emendations in the text, together with a number of 'Explanatory Notes' at the end of each volume, dealing with special points of controversy that have been raised by Dr. Ward's reviewers.

There is a great opportunity at present for the bold and reverent teacher of the Bible. Dr. T. H. Stokoe has almost seized it. His 'Manuals of the New Testament' have not quite filled the void, but they have evidently met the immediate need. His third volume is entitled *First Days and Early Letters of the Church* (Oxford: Clarendon Press; 3s.).

To the 'Temple Classics' Messrs. Dent have added *Verba Christi, the Sayings of Jesus Christ* (1s. 6d. net). The words of our Lord are gathered out of the Gospels and set down in paragraphs, the Greek on one page and the English on the next. Each paragraph has also a heading in Latin and in English. An editorial note at the end tells us that the little volume is the work of Dean Stubbs of Ely. It is worthy of even a great dignitary of the Church.

The Rev. D. M. McIntyre of Glasgow has edited an edition of Thomas Hooker's *Poor Doubting Christian Drawn to Christ*, which has been published at Drummond's Tract Depot, Stirling (6d.).

Messrs. Macmillan have gathered together the late Bishop Westcott's *Christian Social Union Addresses*, and published them in one convenient volume (1s. net).

They have also issued at the same price certain extracts from letters that are anonymous *To Those who Suffer*. It is a small but distinct addition to the library of consolation.

Those of us who were receiving Macmillan's new edition of Thackeray had begun to fear that it had come to an untimely end. Now we find that it is to be by a long way the fullest edition ever issued. An editor has been appointed—Mr. Lewis Melville by name, and everything belonging to Thackeray is to be found and issued in volume after volume, month after month, each volume each month being enriched with Thackeray's own illustrations. The publishers might have put a fancy price upon such an edition. It sells at 3s. 6d. a volume. The new volumes are *Christmas Books* and *Burlesques*.

A new account of the *Life and Writings of Dr. Alexander Murray*, the celebrated philologist, has been written by John Reith, M.A., B.D., and published in Dumfries by Messrs. Maxwell & Son (3s. 6d.). Mr. Reith suspects that this generation is 'ignorant of the greatness of Murray.' It may be ignorant also of his existence. So his book has much to say for itself. But he is not content with making it a life of Murray. He adds a chapter on 'The Science of Language up to Date.'

Two volumes have reached us of 'Newnes' Thin

Paper Classics.' The one volume is the *Works of Charles Lamb*, the other is *Cary's Dante*. They are fully bound in lambskin, the one in yellow and the other in green, with gilt tops; the type is a good size; and the paper, though so thin that the 814 pages of Lamb's works make a volume of only half an inch in thickness, is perfectly opaque, beautifully white, and altogether pleasing to the eye. You may search your bookseller's shop for a Christmas present, but you will find nothing better than 'Newnes' Thin Paper Classics.'

Witnesses from Israel is the title given to a volume of life-stories of Jewish converts to Christianity (Oliphant; 1s. 6d.). The stories are translated from the German of Arnold Frank by Mrs. G. Fleming; and Professor Nicol of Aberdeen commends the book. How great some of the names are: Da Costa, Neander, Caspari, Saphir, Edersheim, Rabinowitz. Surely these men, and there are more than these, were worth winning for Christ at all costs.

Messrs. Oliphant have also published a beautiful lightful book with the curious title *Edifying Lights on God's Paternal Heart* (2s. 6d. net). A devotional commentary on the Lord's Prayer by Bogatzky from the German in 1761. It has been corrected and edited by Professor Laidlaw of New College, Edinburgh; and it has been recommended to the reader by Dr. Whyte of Edinburgh.

In the following note: 'Luther himself wrote better than this. Indeed I have had plenty of fault sometimes in believing that I was not doing a recovered book of the great Reformer.

Protestantism is the doctrine that emancipated Germany in England and Scotland. The prayers especially in the close of each chapter are masterpieces of eloquence. If Coleridge had been alive he would have written a commendatory note worthy of his evangelical gem; or Chalmers.'

It is easier to quote that note than to review the book; but it is also better.

The Open Court Publishing Company of Chicago have published translations of three papers by Professor O. Berg, the great Vedic scholar, under the title *Ancient India, its Language and Religion*. The title is a trifle overreaching, but the papers are packed with original research. The first deals with the study of Sanskrit, the second on the history of the Veda, the third on Buddhism.

Professor Sayce has rewritten his account of *The Hittites* for the R.T.S. 'By-Paths of Bible Knowledge' (2s.). For not only have many Hittite inscriptions been discovered, and not only has much Hittite literature been written since the first edition was issued, fourteen years ago, but Professor Sayce believes that now at last he and Jensen have mastered the baffling problem of Hittite decipherment. It is a popular book still, a marvel of fascination for so difficult a subject.

Mr. James Robinson of Manchester has published three volumes upon the Sermon on the Mount. Together they make up what he calls a practical exposition of the Sermon. Each volume contains about twenty sermons by various writers. The exposition is of course neither complete nor regular. But there are those who prefer variety to uniformity and completeness, and they have that here. Without exception the writers are preachers who have made their mark, and the level of the work contained in the volumes is high. Thus the middle volume, which is occupied entirely with the Lord's Prayer, is written by E. Griffith-Jones, B.A.; Principal P. T. Forsyth, M.A., D.D.; J. G. Greenhough, M.A.; Frank Ballard, M.A., B.Sc.; Principal Alexander Stewart, D.D.; W. B. Selbie, M.A. One noticeable and most welcome feature of the sermons is their scholarship. It is a pity that it should be noticeable, for every man's sermons ought to be accurate in statement. But preachers are only beginning to discover that the closest study of the Word yields the most profitable preaching. In one of these volumes Mr. Griffith-Jones has a sermon on the Beatitude on the 'poor in spirit,' and he shows how Luke's *poor* and Matthew's *poor in spirit* agree, quoting from Sanday's article in the *Dictionary of the Bible*, and referring to the fuller discussion in Bartlett's *Apostolic Age*, where it is proved that in the language of the day the word *poor* had a moral meaning even when it stood by itself.

Mr. Robinson has also published a volume of *Addresses to Boys, Girls, and Young People*, by the Rev. T. Rhondda Williams of Bradford (3s. 6d. net). The addresses contain good, strong meat, without even the condescension of language that is so irritating to young people. No doubt Mr. Williams is right. When sermons are natural in thought and in language, young people understand them quite as well as old.

Mr. William Routh, M.A., has published, through Mr. Elliot Stock, a volume which we have found hard to read, believing all the while that it is worth reading. He gives it the title of *Some Elements towards the At-one-ment of Knowledge and Belief* (5s. net). The difficulty of reading it is due, not to the difficulty of the subject, nor exactly to the faultiness of the language, rather to the distance of Mr. Routh's mind from the concrete and the commonplace. He has a chapter on 'the Immortals of the Worlds of Space.' We cannot get interested in those immortals. We cannot find out where they are, nor what we have to do with them. We thought we had them as the inhabitants of Mars. But in the next chapter we find them in the Bible and present at the Fall. The book is too short for its subject, that is perhaps the whole difficulty.

Mr. Elliot Stock has also published a much smaller book on practically the same subject. Its title is *The Faith of Science, and the Science of Faith* (2s. net). We have no sooner gone into it than we see the mistake we have made in our review of the other. There are only forty-eight pages in this book, against 230 in the other; the subject we say is practically the same; but this is perfectly intelligible. It contains two Essays and Addenda. The Addenda are most exciting, having to do for the most part with ghosts and spiritualism. This book is anonymous.

Mr. Stockwell has published this month *Sermons on Immortality* (2s. 6d. net), by Bernard J. Snell, M.A., B.Sc.; also *Man's Quest* (3s. 6d. net), by the Rev. James Flanagan; and *God's Much More* (2s. net). The last volume, which is anonymous, is more fully described as a brief examination of the principal passages of the New Testament in which God has enforced His statements by the words *much more*. It is a common but pedantic and unedifying way of studying Scripture. There is most matter in Mr. Snell's book.

The latest issue of the Rationalist Press Association (Watts & Co.) is Darwin's *Origin of Species* (6d.). There is little offence in that.

But in fairness to a long-suffering public, it is surely time that the other side were given a chance. First of all the publishers, Messrs. Macmillan, have discovered that. They have published this

month, at the same popular price, Archdeacon Wilson's *Problems of Religion and Science*. It is a book which no honest man can say is too narrow for him.

Four pamphlets worth noticing are *Theism Found Wanting*, by W. S. Godfrey (Watts; 4d. net); *The Place of the Bible in Secular Education*, by Stewart D. Headlam (Brown, Langham, & Co.; 6d.); *Notes on the Intermediate State*, by Canon Gell (Elliot Stock; 6d.); and *The Loom of Life*, by F. N. Peloubet, D.D. (Sunday School Union; 6d. net).

Christmas Books.

THE first parcel has come from the Sunday School Union. It contains *The Boys of Our Empire* (7s. 6d.), *The Girls' Empire* (5s.), *Young England* (5s.), and *The Child's Own Magazine* (1s.), each in its annual volume; and also *The Wonderful Castle* (1s.), a volume of the 'Red Nursery' Series.

The two which appeal to us most are *The Boys of Our Empire* and *The Girls' Empire*. *The Boys of Our Empire* has all the usual attractions: serial stories, short complete stories, puns, pictures, and general articles. Besides this, however, it has several unique features. We all know the usual competitions where large sums of money are offered for what must be after all only guess work; competitions which waste boys' time and do little good. The competitions in *The Boys of Our Empire* are not of that kind. In them the prize goes to the boy who has taken most trouble to study the subject, and whether the competitors gain prizes or not their time will not have been wasted. In one of these competitions, for example, two prizes are offered of £25 and £20 respectively to the two boys who answer examination questions set by Sir John Cockburn on the geography of Australia. A series of articles entitled 'Champions of the Week' is also unique.

Every boy should take *The Boys of Our Empire* out weekly. It only costs 1d.

There is no reason for the girls to be jealous of their brothers. Mr. Melrose has looked after their interests in *The Girls' Empire*. This is but its second year of issue, but we have no fear of its success. It contains too many good stories and articles to fail. Its illustrations also are both artistic and up to date.

Mr. Melrose has sent later *Teens and Girls Together* (3s. 6d. each), two stories of Australian schoolgirl life by Louise Mack. *Girls Together* is the sequel to *Teens*. In many ways they are the best girls' stories that we have seen this season. The characters have individuality, especially harum-scarum Lennie; and the book is full of fun. The practical jokes in which her brother Bert indulged and the manner in which he was repaid are very entertaining.

The illustrations are a decided feature of both books. So often illustrations are a drawback to a book, because they either do not express the author's meaning, or they are badly executed.

Mr. Melrose has done his best also to make the outside of the books attractive, and he has succeeded.

Mr. Melrose has also published two books for boys by Robert Leighton: *Fighting Fearful Odds* (3s. 6d.), and *The Haunted Ship* (5s.). The latter is a story of Devon smugglers. From beginning to end it is exciting, and the hairbreadth escapes of its hero, Jan Pentire, will delight all its readers. *Fighting Fearful Odds* is a book with a moral, but its moral is not too obtrusive.

Pussy Meow, by S. Louise Patteson (Melrose; 2s. 6d.), will be appreciated by all lovers of animals. It tells the story of a cat who was christened 'Pussy Meow' by her first mistress, but whose name was altered many times as she passed from one person to another. We somehow have not quite as much interest in Meow as we had in our old friends Black Beauty and Beautiful Joe. They were almost human in their aspirations, but Meow's highest thought is to be comfortable herself. She only cares for people in proportion to their kindness to her.

Despite this fact, it is a nicely written story, and will please most children who are fond of cats.

Messrs. Marshall have published *The Oak and Ivy*, by Florence A. Markham (2s. 6d.). It is a temperance tale. The Oak and Ivy was a public-house. It took its name from an ancient oak which stood before the door. The trunk of the oak was covered with ivy, and underneath the ivy was nothing but rotten wood. Miss Markham's object is to point out that this rotten tree was a 'fit emblem of the wretched and ruined lives of

those who, like it, have welcomed the insidious enemy, to their eternal destruction.'—the 'insidious enemy' being, of course, drink. The book paints the horrors of intemperance vividly. But if any good is to be done that is necessary.

Messrs. Nisbet have published two children's books that are original enough in their idea to separate them from the crowd this Christmas season. The one tells the story of the little boys and girls of the Bible. It is called *Hidden Heroes of the Bible* (1s. net.). Each story is to be read to our own little boys and girls, who have then to guess who the story is about and answer other questions found in the Quiz Box at the end of each chapter. It is an easy and excellent way of giving the little ones an interest in the Bible narratives.

The other book is *The Story of Jesus* (1s. 6d.), told for little children, and illustrated by Anne Batchelor. Its big type and coloured illustrations are its special attractions.

The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge has just issued five books: *Calder Creek*, by Edith E. Cowper (2s. 6d.); *Mrs. Groom's Legacy* (2s.) and *The Mark of Cain* (2s. 6d.), by Emily Pearson Finnemore; *Theodora Phranza*, by the Rev. J. M. Neale M.A.; and *Frank Warleigh's Holidays*, by Achilles Daunt. The last named is a book for boys. It is an account of how two boys spent their summer holidays camping out in their own grounds. Their situation was ordinary, but their adventures were not. They killed a lion which had escaped from a menagerie, and they shot a mad dog as it was on the point of attacking a young girl, both with the greatest of ease and as if they were everyday occurrences. Every boy will find the book exciting. The improbability of the adventures will not lessen the enjoyment.

Of Miss Finnemore's two stories *Mrs. Groom's Legacy* attracts us most. The characters are clearly drawn, and we never lose interest in the plot. Mrs. Groom was a woman who had been soured by misfortune. She was compelled to get relief from the 'parish,' and the only legacy which she left Mina, her daughter, was the responsibility of repaying that money. The book tells how Mina did so, and what it cost her.

The Mark of Cain, Miss Finnemore's other

book, is manifestly written with a purpose. That purpose is to warn all her readers against the sin of jealousy.

Calder Creek is a brightly written smuggling tale. The chief characters are the twin-brothers, Dennis and David Danavall. Dennis, though weak, is merry and popular, but David is quiet and reserved. They are alike in personal appearance, and on that fact the plot of the story turns. All the people introduced are natural.

Theodora Phranza, by the late Rev. J. M. Neale,

is a reprint. It is an historical tale of the fall of Constantinople.

Into *The Lights of Home* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s.) David Lyall has gathered a number of papers which have delighted many a reader in the *British Weekly* and elsewhere. The most important is the story entitled 'A Woman Journalist.' The identity of David Lyall has been well preserved, but there are touches in this book that are quite unique and inimitable.

Contributions and Comments.

The Bible and Modern Criticism.

IF the question were asked whether the Bible is read in our day with greater care and attention than in the past, it is probable that very different answers would be given. On the one hand we see the growth of a vast biblical literature. The increased knowledge which has come to us from many quarters—from a better understanding of ancient languages, from inscriptions long buried beneath the sands of Egypt and Assyria, from the advance in historical methods of study—has been brought to bear on the Bible, and has shed light on many things that were formerly unintelligible, and has done much to remove the difficulties which perplexed, and the misunderstandings which misled, Bible readers of former generations. At the same time, it would be idle to deny that there exists at the present time, in the minds of many, a scarcely defined idea that the Bible no longer occupies the same pre-eminent position as in the past. They are aware that the accounts of the Creation, in the first chapters of Genesis, are not those which modern science gives of the history of our earth. They may have read, perhaps in a theological novel (that strange product of our times), that the Gospels are unhistorical. They see that many of the sentiments expressed in the Old Testament are not in accordance with the spirit of Christianity. Hence a vague feeling takes possession of them that the authority of the Bible has been discredited, and that it is no longer worthy of their belief and veneration.

It can hardly be doubted that much of the uncertainty that such people profess to feel with

regard to the truth of the biblical records, is due to the indolence and superficiality which is content to acquiesce in a shallow scepticism, and shrinks from the effort of further research. But perplexities of the kind we have mentioned are not confined to the indifferent and the semi-educated, and must press with special force on those who, in the course of their work, are expected to give scriptural instruction. The conscientious teacher is thus often confronted with the question: How can I teach others to regard the Bible as an authoritative guide in matters of belief and practice, whilst I myself feel such difficulty in accepting all that it contains?

It is quite certain that some methods of biblical interpretation which appeared satisfactory and even commendable to our forefathers can no longer be regarded as permissible. Thus, by means of a violent process of allegorizing, it was possible to derive edification from the most unpromising genealogy, and to extract some spiritual meaning out of every detail of an intricate ritual. In the earlier ages of the Church, when the system of allegorical interpretation was more in vogue than at the present day, the consciences of many Christians revolted against so artificial and unworthy a treatment of the Scriptures, and with our fuller knowledge we should not, and need not, resort to any such desperate expedients. If we would understand the Bible we must be prepared to study it with a single-minded desire for learning the truth about it, and abandon all attempts to force into its utterances our own ideas, however excellent. Then many of its most perplexing difficulties will disappear. We shall not

expect the writers of the Bible to express themselves in the terms of modern science, for we recognize that the purpose of its writing was a religious, not a scientific, one; and that its great concern is not with details of geology and chronology, but with the ideas underlying all Nature and History. Or again, when studied in connexion with the religious ideas of other races, the imperfect morality of the Old Testament, and the imperfect forms of worship which it brings before us, cease to appear unworthy of a place in the pages of a Divine Revelation, for they are seen to be steps in the gradual education by which mankind was led up from the grosser forms of primitive religion to the Faith of Christ.

The great truths of Christianity, so far then from being invalidated by historical research, assume a deeper interest than ever before, and the solid foundations on which they rest are more clearly perceived when the false notions which were supposed to support them have been cleared away.

The great need for some more definite instruction on these lines must have been felt by many, and with the view of meeting it, a scheme which originated with Miss Margaret Benson, has lately been successfully carried out at Cambridge. A vacation term extending over three weeks was arranged, during which courses of lectures were given on subjects connected with the critical study of the Bible, by such eminent scholars as Professor Kirkpatrick, Professor Barnes, Canon Kennett, Mr. C. F. Burney, and Mr. W. C. Allen, of Oxford (on the Old Testament), and by Professor Swete, Mr. F. C. Burkitt, Professor Stanton, and Dr. Beet (on the New Testament). Dr. Rashdall also gave a course of lectures on 'The Philosophy of Religion.' In connexion with each course a conversation class was held, at which every one had the opportunity of asking questions or bringing forward difficulties which called for further discussion. Besides these, addresses on subjects of interest to biblical students were given by lecturers possessing special qualifications, *e.g.* Dr. Agnes Lewis, the discoverer of the Sinai palimpsest of the Gospels, spoke on the MSS of the New Testament; Dr. Naville, the excavator of Pithom, lectured on the route of the Exodus; Dr. M. R. James on the Apocryphal Gospels, and Mr. Johns on the Code of Khammurabi. A few addresses on the teaching of the Bible in schools, according to modern historical

methods, were of special interest to the teachers, who formed a considerable proportion of the students; and Professor Gwatkin gave two lectures on the general principles of biblical study.

These meetings took place in one of the halls of Newnham College, and in the old hall of the College and at Girton College many of the ladies who came up to Cambridge for the vacation term were accommodated. The lectures were attended by about 150 ladies, and were followed with the deepest interest. The bitterness which too often characterizes theological discussion was happily absent, although the audience was very varied in character, and included people who differed widely in their religious views, and whose fields of work were very diverse, and lay far apart. It was satisfactory to note with what thankfulness and appreciation many of the students spoke of the instruction they had received; and a general wish was expressed for another course of lectures next summer, and for some system of continuous biblical study on historical lines in the meantime.

The success of this first vacation term for biblical study fully justifies the conviction that there is a very real demand on the part of educated women for that wider knowledge of Scripture which modern scholarship has made possible; and also that critical methods, when applied to the study of the Bible, and undertaken in a reverent spirit and with an open mind, are felt to serve the highest interests of Divine Truth. G. M. BEVAN.

London.

St. Peter in the Jewish Liturgy.

It may be of some interest to call attention anew to the existence of a curious tradition which connects the name of the Apostle Peter with a prayer extant in the Jewish Liturgy, and which, whatever view be taken of its historical trustworthiness, possesses a peculiar interest of its own. The prayer in question is the so-called 'Benediction of Song' (ברכת השיר), which is recited at the end of the first section of the Sabbath morning prayers in the synagogue.¹ In its modern (amplified) form it can be seen in Singer's edition of the *Jewish Prayer-Book* (Hebrew and English), pp. 125 ff.

¹ Also in the home service for the first two nights of Passover (Seder nights).

From its opening word it is technically known as *Nishmath* (נִשְׁמַת).

In its principal sections the prayer runs as follows:—

1. (ג.) *The breath* (נִשְׁמַת) *of every living being shall bless Thy name, O Lord our God, and the spirit of all flesh shall continually glorify and exalt Thy memorial; from everlasting to everlasting Thou art God; etc.*

The God of the first and of the last, the God of all creatures, the Lord of all generations, who is extolled with many praises, and guideth His world with loving kindness and His creatures with tender compassion, etc.

To Thee alone we give thanks.

2. (ו.) *And though* (וְאַלּוּ)¹ *our mouth were full of song as the sea, and our tongue with shouting as the roar of its billows;*

And our lips with praise, as the spaces of the firmament;

And our eyes flashing, like the sun and the moon;

And our hands outspread, like the eagles of heaven;

And our feet swift as the hinds;

We could not thank Thee enough, O Lord our God, and our fathers' God! nor bless Thy name; for one in a thousand of the thousands of thousands and the myriads of myriads, in number, of the benefits which Thou hast bestowed upon our fathers and upon us. Out of Egypt Thou didst ransom us, O Lord our God, and from the house of bondage Thou didst redeem us; in famine Thou feddest us, and in plenty thou maintainedst us; from the sword Thou didst rescue us, and from plague Thou didst deliver us; and from sore and stubborn sicknesses Thou didst set us free.

3. (ע.) *Hitherto* (עַד־הַנּוּהָ) *have Thy tender mercies holpen us, and Thy loving kindnesses have not forsaken us; cast us not off, O Lord our God, for ever, etc.*

Every mouth shall give thanks unto Thee, and every tongue shall swear unto Thee; every knee shall bow to Thee, and whatsoever is lofty shall prostrate itself before Thee; all hearts shall fear Thee, and all the inward parts and reins shall sing unto Thy name, according to the word that is written (Ps 35¹⁰): All my bones shall say, Lord, who is like unto Thee? etc.

¹ The ordinary editions give אֵל simply. For the evidence for the reading וְאַלּוּ (which is required by the acrostic) see Baer, *Abodath Israel*, p. 207 note.

4. (מ.) *Who is like unto Thee* (מִי יִדְמֶה־לָּךְ), *who is equal to Thee, who can be compared unto Thee, O God, etc.*

Thou art God in Thy power and might, great is Thy glorious name, mighty for ever and awful by Thy awful acts, Thou King that sittest upon a throne high and exalted!

5. (ש.) *He that inhabiteth eternity* (שׁוֹכֵן עַד)—*high and holy is His name; and it is written: Exult in the Lord, O ye righteous; praise is seemly for the upright.*

[Then follow some paragraphs which were probably added to the prayer at a later time.]

I.

The first point to notice about the prayer is that it is substantially of considerable antiquity. One of its paragraphs—the beautiful section numbered (2) above—is quoted in the Talmud (*Berākhôth* 59b)² by its opening words: '*Were our mouth full of song as the sea*'—in connexion with the blessings said for rain (עַל הַגְּשָׁמִים).³

In its original form the benediction may have been composed mainly as a thanksgiving for the bestowal of much-needed rain, which, of course, was always a matter of great importance in an agricultural country like Palestine. Apart from certain easily separable interpolations—such as *from everlasting to everlasting Thou art God, and beside Thee we have no King, Redeemer, or Saviour*—which seem to display an anti-Christian tendency, the other elements in the benediction consist of thanksgiving for past mercies and favours generally (see (3) above), and a section on the seemliness of praise to Israel's God (see (4) above), all forming a consistent whole. If the interpolations are rightly explained as anti-Christian in tendency, another

² Wrongly cited in Dembitz, *Jewish Services*, etc., as *Berakoth* 50b.

³ The passage runs: מאימתי מברכין על הגשמים? משיצא חתן לקראת כלה. מאי מברכין? אמר רב יהודה. מודים אנחנו לך על כל טפה ושפה שהורדת לנו. ורבי יוחנן מסיים בה הכי. אילו פינו מלא שרה כים. וכו'. אין אנו מספיקין להודות יי' אלהינו. עד שתחתה. ברוך אתה יי' רוב ההודאה. *From what time is the blessing said over rain? As soon as the bridegroom goes forth to meet the bride [i.e. as Rashi explains, when the rain is so heavy that drops spring back from the ground to meet the descending drops]. What blessing is said? Rab Judah said: "We thank Thee for every single drop which Thou hast permitted to descend to us." And Rabbi Johanan concluded it thus: "Though our mouth were full of song as the sea, etc., we could not thank Thee enough, O Lord our God," up to "shall prostrate itself. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, the mighty in thanksgivings."*

indication is afforded of the antiquity of the original composition, and this is confirmed by the purity of the diction. It must, at least, be as old as the age of the Mishna.¹

II.

This brings us to the most interesting point in connexion with the composition, viz. the question of authorship. According to an old Jewish tradition the prayer was composed by the Apostle Peter. The grounds for this are, as we shall see, not very cogent, and the tradition itself fluctuates, probably because it represents nothing more than a passing Jewish fancy. The one fairly certain inference as to authorship that may be deduced from its literary form is that it was composed by a person of the name of Simon. It will be noticed that the initial letters of the clauses numbered (1) to (5) above form in acrostic the name Simon (שמעון) written backwards. On this datum Jewish tradition has apparently worked, with the result that several Simons, including Simon Peter (here inaccurately styled Simon, son of Cephas), have been credited with its production.²

The prayer is thus an interesting specimen of 'nominal acrostic,' and though (so far as I can discover) it is not mentioned in this connexion by Zunz,³ it must be one of the earliest specimens of its kind—if not the earliest—extant in the Jewish Liturgy. Though such 'nominal' acrostics (i.e. compositions giving the author's name in acrostic)

¹ So Baer, *Abodath Israel*, p. 206 note.

² Baer's words (*Abodath Israel*, p. 206 note) are: 'I found in an ancient MS. commentary on the Siddur (Jewish Liturgy), of the year 1405, which belonged to the use of Trèves, the following note: "I have heard from R. Judah bar-Jacob that R. Simon, son of Cephas (ר' שמעון בן כפא) composed NISHMATH as far as (the paragraph beginning) מִי יִרְמָה לֵךְ (= clause 4 above)."' Baer goes on to mention that elsewhere the prayer is attributed to Simon ben-Kappa (בן כפא), and even to Simon ben-Shetaḥ (c. 75 B.C.).

³ *Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden*, 2nd ed. p. 391 f. note.

only became common in the gaonic age⁴ (seventh to eleventh century), it is worth recalling here that, according to some scholars, a biblical specimen is extant in Ps 110¹⁻⁴, the initial letters of which verses, beginning with the words of the oracle, (^{1b}) yield שמעון, i.e. Simon (? the Maccabee). In this case, however, if the Simon referred to be Simon the Maccabee (142–135 B.C.), the acrostic probably indicated, not the author, but the subject of the poem.

Of course it is conceivable that while some elements of the prayer *Nishmath* may be ancient (e.g. the second paragraph), yet the acrostic arrangement is later. The tradition referred to above, however, seems to reflect a persistent belief in the antiquity of the acrostic arrangement.

G. H. Box.

Merchant Taylors' School, London, E.C.

A Little Mistake in the Revised Version.

MARK VI. 25.

FOR 'the Baptist' the R.V. has in the margin of Mk 6²⁴ and ²⁵ 'Gr. *the Baptizer*.' But according to Scrivener the Revisers read τοῦ Βαπτίζοντος only in v.²⁴, not so in v.²⁵. This agrees with Tischendorf, Tregelles, Westcott-Hort, who all read Βαπτίζοντος only in v.²⁴; in v.²⁵ no Greek MS. gives the participle, except Codex L. The figure referring to the marginal note must be deleted, therefore, in v.²⁵ in the R.V.

A similar mistake was formerly seen in Lk 16, where the figure referring to the marginal note, 'Gr. *bondservants*,' had been added not only to v.²², where it is correct, but also to v.²⁶, where it is wrong. This mistake has been corrected in later impressions; therefore I have hope also for Mk 6²⁵.

Maulbronn.

EB. NESTLE.

⁴ See I. Abrahams in *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, s.v. 'Acrostics.'

Entre Nous.

THE EXTRA VOLUME of the *Dictionary of the Bible* is nearly ready. It will be a full volume, ranging in size with those already published. Besides its articles, it will contain indexes to the whole work. The indexes will be of Subjects, Texts, Hebrew and Greek Words, and Authors.

The Index of Authors will give the name of every person who has contributed to the work and a list of his contributions.

The *Dictionary* had not proceeded far when the editor saw that an Extra Volume would be required.

Not for the indexes only. There is a greater necessity than that. The study of the Bible is no longer confined to the Bible. The Old Testament cannot properly be understood without some knowledge of the religion of the Babylonians, Egyptians, and other nations. The New Testament cannot be understood without some study of the social and political life of Palestine, the condition of the Jews of the Dispersion, and the development of religious thought in the period between the Old Testament and the New.

The question accordingly arose, whether the scope of the *Dictionary* should be so enlarged as to take in all these subjects, or whether they should be gathered into a separate volume. The latter plan has been followed. Only an Extra Volume seemed to give scope enough to handle them adequately, and without full treatment they would be of little use.

So the Extra Volume will contain fewer articles than any of its predecessors, but the articles are nearly all of considerable size. Professor W. M. Ramsay writes three articles, one on the RELIGION OF GREECE AND ASIA MINOR, one on ROADS AND TRAVEL IN THE NEW TESTAMENT, and one on NUMBERS, HOURS, AND DATES. The article on ROADS AND TRAVEL in the Old Testament is written by Professor Buhl of Leipzig, who also writes on the NEW TESTAMENT TIMES. These articles will be made serviceable by four double-page maps. Those who have read Professor Ramsay's 'Greece and Asia Minor' consider it the most original work he has yet produced.

Among the articles demanded by the new study of the Old Testament are those on the RELIGION OF THE BABYLONIANS AND ASSYRIANS, by Professor Morris Jastrow; on the RELIGION OF THE EGYPTIANS, by Professor Wiedemann; and on the RELIGION OF ISRAEL, by Professor Kautzsch. Three articles by Professor König have their place here also, together with Professor Garvie's article on REVELATION and Canon Stanton's on the THEOCRACY; Admiral Blomfield's on SHIPS AND BOATS; Professor Bennett's on the WAGES of the ancient working-man; Professor Morris Jastrow's on the RACES OF THE OLD TESTAMENT; and Professor McCurdy's on the SEMITES.

The New Testament is reached after Dr. James Drummond has written on PHILO and Mr. Thackeray on JOSEPHUS; after the elaborate article on the DEVELOPMENT OF THEOLOGY IN THE APOCRYPHAL PERIOD, by Mr. Fairweather; and an article on the DISPERSION, by Professor Schürer, which has perhaps more special knowledge packed into it than any article in the volume.

It has been said that the study of the New Testament demands some knowledge of the preceding life and literature of the Jews. It also demands some accurate knowledge of the literature that came after. More perhaps than the Old Testament Apocrypha do the earliest Christian writings throw light on the essential nature of the revelation that came with Christ. The Extra Volume will accordingly describe somewhat fully the DIDACHE (by Professor Vernon Bartlet), the DIATHESSARON (by Mr. J. F. Stenning), the APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS (by Professor Tasker), the GOSPEL ACCORDING TO THE HEBREWS (by Professor Allan Menzies), and the SIBYLLINE ORACLES (by Dr. Rendel Harris).

There may be articles that bear still more closely on the right understanding of the New Testament than these. Perhaps Professor Ropes's AGRAPHA and Dr. Kenyon's PAPYRI do. They both bring their subjects up to date, and include the most recent discoveries. A very valuable article will be contributed by Mr. C. H. Turner on PATRISTIC INTERPRETATION, and another by Dr. Schechter on the TALMUD; while the interpretation of the New Testament will be directly aided by what Professor Votaw has done for the SERMON ON THE MOUNT and Professor H. M. Scott for the doctrine of the TRINITY. According to this arrangement the last in order would be Mr. J. O. F. Murray's study of the NEW TESTAMENT TEXTUAL CRITICISM, Dr. J. H. Lupton's original and elaborate article on the ENGLISH VERSIONS, and Principal Bebb's useful account of the CONTINENTAL VERSIONS OF THE BIBLE.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, St. Cyrus, Montrose.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

At the annual general meeting of the Palestine Exploration Fund, Sir Charles Wilson gave an address on the discoveries in Palestine during the preceding year. His address is published in the *Quarterly Statement* for October.

The discoveries have been made at Gezer. Other discoveries have been made in Palestine by other discoverers. Dr. Sellin has made discoveries at Taanach. But the discoveries made by Mr. Stewart Macalister at Gezer are the discoveries of the Palestine Exploration Fund, and they are great enough to warrant the enthusiasm of the Fund at their annual meeting.

Mr. Stewart Macalister is evidently an ideal explorer. He can dig and he can decipher. And, 'I think,' says Sir Charles Wilson, 'we may absolutely depend upon his judgment whenever he says that a particular object belongs to a Jewish or a Canaanite period.' He has added some chapters to the history of Palestine and some chapters to the history of Religion in the world. He has succeeded in showing that Gezer has been occupied by men from the Neolithic Age down to the time of the Maccabees.

There are seven periods of occupation. The lowest strata of débris reveal two periods belonging to an aboriginal non-Semitic race. They were

of slight build. None exceeded 5 feet 7 inches in stature, and most were under 5 feet 4 inches. They lived in caves, and cremated their dead.

When the third period opens a new race appears. The cave-dwellers have been dispossessed by a Semitic people who lived in houses of mud and stone, crowded together like any modern village in Palestine, and surrounded with a wall. They were taller than the cave-dwellers, from 5 feet 7 inches to 5 feet 11 inches in height, and their skulls were well developed, their racial type being not unlike that of the modern Arab. They did not cremate but buried their dead, sometimes using the crematorium caves of the aborigines as their sepulchres.

When they buried their dead the Semites of these two periods (sometimes, at any rate) buried food and weapons with them. Their weapons were of exceptionally fine bronze. Terra-cotta plaques, with figures of the goddess Ashtoreth in low relief, have been found in abundance, and every plaque is broken, as if some rite demanded the fracture of the goddess's image. The finds bring out a connexion at this time with Egypt, for there are many scarabs and impressions of scarab-seals of the Middle Empire. There are Babylonian and Syrian cylinders also. And in the

upper stratum of the two the pottery shows the influence of Ægean art.

These pre-Israelite Semites of Gezer had their Bamah or High Place. This is Mr. Macalister's great discovery in the débris belonging to the third period of occupation. It consists of a group of monoliths, from 5 feet 5 inches to 10 feet 9 inches high, aligned in a gentle curve of which the chord is nearly north and south. It stood on the saddle between the two knolls. Inside was found the skull of a man of alien race. Sir Charles Wilson recalls the statement that the head of Goliath was brought to Jerusalem and buried there.

The fifth and sixth strata represent the occupation of Gezer by the Israelites. In the fifth layer the High Place begins to lose a little of its sanctity; private houses encroach upon its precincts. This city was destroyed by the Pharaoh whose daughter was given in marriage to Solomon. When Solomon rebuilt it he restricted its area, which in the sixth stratum covers only the western knoll, and enclosed it with a wall. The sixth period is the period of the kings. Jar handles have royal stamps with the legend 'To the king' upon them. Before it ends the High Place has lost almost all, if not all, its sanctity, a result which Sir Charles Wilson thinks may have been due to the reforming zeal of Josiah.

If the third and fourth periods had their surprise in the discovery of the High Place of Gezer, the fifth and sixth periods have a greater surprise. Under the foundation of the houses are found deposits of lamps and bowls. They are of various sizes, and of different patterns. Sometimes they are single; often one large lamp or bowl has smaller lamps or bowls within it. What were these lamps and bowls for, and why were they placed under the foundations of the houses? Sir Charles Wilson cannot answer these questions. But in the same *Statement* Mr. Macalister himself suggests an answer. For in the same *Statement* is published Mr. Macalister's latest report of his excavations;

it is occupied chiefly with these lamps and bowls, and it associates them with another discovery made in the same Israelite periods of occupation, a discovery that is much more astonishing.

It is the discovery that when the Israelites laid the foundation of a house they buried an infant beneath it. The infant was probably alive when they buried it there. At first, at any rate, it was probably alive. Mr. Macalister believes that he can trace successive stages in the practice of this rite, each stage being less barbarous and more symbolical. And with this evolution of the sacrifice he associates the bowl and lamp deposits.

The Israelites began their occupation of Palestine with rites which they afterwards abhorred. Like the nations around them they laid the foundation of their homes in blood. It was a religious ceremony. And in so far as it was a religious ceremony they put us to shame; for we consider God when the foundation-stone of our churches is laid, but forget Him when we begin to build our homes. It was a religious ceremony. And its manner was in accordance with the religion of the time. Infant sacrifice was common. An infant, probably alive, was laid beneath the wall. That was the first step.

The second step was taken when the infant was slain and its body put into a jar before burial. Several jars have been found with the bones of infants in them. In one instance the bones of two infants have been found in one jar. Mr. Macalister believes that they were twins. These jars were then placed under the wall, either at the corners of houses or chambers, or else under the jambs of the doors.

A third step in the evolution of this religious rite was taken when other jars, probably containing food for the victim, were placed beside the jar which contained its body. Then came the great change. The fourth step was the abolition of the human sacrifice. Instead of a jar containing an

infant, there was placed a bowl containing blood (or grape juice as a substitute for blood) and a lamp. The blood was a symbol of the sacrifice, the lamp was a symbol of fire. Last of all, the victim and the blood were omitted, the symbolic lamps and bowls were deposited alone.

In these fifth and sixth periods the pottery is mostly of the Jewish pattern. Iron is in use, but weapons of bronze are still common, and even flint implements have not altogether disappeared. The flint objects are of inferior workmanship however, as if the art of working in stone had been lost. There are proofs that the prophets had reason for their denunciation of idolatry. Among the discoveries are a fine bronze statuette of Osiris, with remains of gilding, and a bronze statuette of Ashtoreth Karnaim, or the horned Astarte. It is the only perfect image of that goddess that has yet been found. The horns, says Sir Charles Wilson, seem to represent rams' horns and not the crescent moon.

The top stratum represents the occupation of Gezer that followed the Captivity. The change is most instructive. Iron is the metal in common use, bronze being employed only for ornament, and flint is unknown. But more than that, idolatry has come to an end. There are no more statuettes of Astarte, there are no more infants' bones, the bowls and the lamps have all disappeared; there is no trace of worship in connexion with the High Place. At the north end of the High Place some of the great stones have been deliberately destroyed. Mr. Macalister believes that it was the work of Simon Maccabæus, who cast out all the pollutions of Gezer and placed such men there as would keep the law.

In the *Church Quarterly Review* for July there is an article dealing exclusively with the volume of sermons by the late Professor A. B. Davidson, of which the title is, *The Called of God*. It is an article by an English Churchman and by an

adherent of the High Church party. But the writer appreciates Dr. Davidson. He sees him 'possessed of strong independence, not to say individualism, of character, mingled with a no less strong sense of ancestry and home affection, which belongs to the best Scottish type.' And he sees that such a spirit was peculiarly in sympathy with the Hebrew prophets, and was called to be their interpreter.

There are two things that are characteristic of the Hebrew prophets and of Professor Davidson. There is the wistfulness with which they looked out upon the mystery of the world, and there is the unwavering trust in the unchanging God which they brought to the solution of life's perennial problems. The Hebrew prophets were not philosophers; Dr. Davidson was not a philosopher. He insists that even Job will have nothing to do with 'abstract philosophizing.' He never philosophizes himself. In this lay the most marked distinction between him and his predecessor, 'Rabbi' Duncan. Duncan grasped things in their totality. His mind was the mind of a systematic theologian. In Davidson's sermons there is no systematic theology. His approach to religion was that of concrete personal experience and human need. 'God's voice,' he said—this is from the sermon on the Call of Abraham—'is self-evidencing. It approves itself to man as the voice of God. Abraham had evidence which he could not resist.'

Davidson, says this anonymous reviewer, resembled the Hebrew prophets in the wistfulness with which he looked out upon the mystery of life. He did not philosophize about it. He saw it, and he saw God in it, and he waited. And this did not make life less to him but greater. Do you remember the sermon upon Saul's Reprobation?—'It is not amiss for us just to stand before this spectacle of a great human misery, a perplexed unhappy life, even where one should have supposed all the elements of happiness were present. Such a sight gives us thoughts of life not without

use to us, and makes us wonder at the elements of misery enwrought into it, and life becomes to us something more mysterious, greater, less trivial; and the higher the mind, and the more lofty the part in life, the more and greater seem to be the possibilities of wretchedness. Life seems at first sight like the bright sunlight, one single element of brightness; yet, when in maturer years we analyse it, we discover it to be made up of many varied colours, and between the colours there are dark unresolvable lines that will yield to no analysis. In human life there are mysterious veins of misery, do what you will.'

The *Church Quarterly* reviewer does not altogether approve of that. Dr. Davidson was as the Hebrew prophet, and saw the misery of life. He saw also with the prophet the mercy of God. He saw that the mercy was sufficient for the misery. But he should have gone beyond the Hebrew prophet. He should have passed into the New Testament and found that sufficient mercy has become Christian joy. 'The facts of the gospel,' says the reviewer, 'have surely power, not merely to countervail, but to transfigure the sorrows of the world.'¹

'I am wondering,' writes Professor Ramsay to Dr. Sanday,—'From the words in your preface about Capernaum, I am wondering whether you

¹ Is the *Church Quarterly* reviewer right? It is not jealousy for a great reputation that makes us ask, it is not that alone. But is he right? For the most part, it may be conceded, Davidson did look out upon the wrestle of life. He was deeply interested in Saul and Isaiah's choice young men who sometimes utterly fall. And he did so because he saw the reality of life's struggle as few have seen it. He saw that a man had to undertake it for himself, that the mercy of God did not deliver from the severity of the temptation a man had to master. But it is altogether wrong, as it seems to us, to think that he saw nothing in God but a readiness to meet life's failures with sufficient mercy. He saw God rejoicing in the victory not less than pardoning the defeat. Another volume of sermons is about to be published, under the title of *Waiting upon God*. We have had the privilege of reading that volume in proof. One of the sermons is on the Temptation of our Lord, and these words occur in it:—

'The next lesson is the *joy* that comes when temptation is

are going through the same process as I did; namely, a first impression in favour of *Khân Minyeh* gradually giving way to the arguments for *Tell Hâm*.'

Dr. Sanday went to Palestine last summer with one subject very much in his thoughts, the question as to the true site of Capernaum. The question, he says, affects the very heart of our Lord's ministry, and he was specially anxious to reach a clear decision upon it. But when he came back he 'could not feel that all the difficulties were removed or that the question was wholly solved.' In the preface to his book, *Sacred Sites of the Gospels* (Oxford: Clarendon Press), and as his last word on the subject, he said: 'Of all the decisions that I had come to, the site of Capernaum is that as to which my own doubts are strongest.' It was in reference to that sentence that Professor Ramsay wrote to him.

For, on the whole, Dr. Sanday had decided in his book in favour of *Khân Minyeh*. For one thing, he was impressed by the weight of authority in its favour. He exhibited the history of opinion very clearly by means of a comparative table. But let us first of all see where *Khân Minyeh* and *Tell Hâm* lie.

For that purpose we shall refer to an article on this question which Professor Sanday has contributed to the current issue of the *Journal of Theo-*

overcome. It is said: The devil leaveth Him, and, behold, angels came and ministered unto Him. Neither men nor angels helped Him when tempted. God seemed to stand aside and watch the struggle. A father will watch with intensest absorption the trial of his children, see the higher principles called out by the emergency, see them wrestle with the lower desires, and finally rise to preponderance and gain the victory. Joyful will be the moment when he clasps a victorious child in his arms. Joyful the moment for the child, joyful for the feeling of higher sympathy. The angels ministered to Christ. They brought Him that which He needed. When we have carried on a long struggle, and have been pinched or in distress, and have felt as if we must give way, and have only been upheld by every hour naming God, saying, God is able, God will not fail us; then, when the relief comes at last, there is a strange sense that it has come direct from God,—angels come and minister to us.'

logical Studies. The article is written to register a change of opinion, to which we shall come in a moment. In that article Dr. Sanday gives a sketch map of the locality. Here it is—



Khân Minyeh, we see, lies between *Magdala* and *Tell Hûm*. It is fully three miles from the former and scarcely two from the latter place. If you have arrived at *Khân Minyeh* and are to proceed to *Tell Hûm*, you leave the road and pass through a curious cutting in the rock. This cutting is some three feet deep and wide. Dr. Sanday believes that it was originally an aqueduct, used for conveying water from the fine springs of *et-Tâbigha* to the plain behind. This *et-Tâbigha* was once known as Heptapegon, or Seven Springs, and the Arabic is clearly a corruption of the Greek name. After less than two miles' walk you reach *Tell Hûm*.

Now in the contest between these two places for the site of Capernaum, *Tell Hûm* has the first advantage in its name. It is objected that there is no *tell*, that is, no hill or mound at hand, and that the name is a corruption for *Tanhum* or *Tenhum*. Dr Sanday put the question directly to his dragoman, 'an intelligent specimen of his class,' whether the site could possibly be described as a *tell*, and he answered decidedly, No.

For all that, *Tell Hûm* has the advantage of the name. It is possible, and may easily be considered probable, that *Câphar Nahum*, or Village of Nahum, that is, Capernaum, passed on Arabic lips into *Tell Hûm*, or Nahum's Mound of Ruins.

In picturesqueness, if there is any argument in that, *Khân Minyeh* has it. Says Dr. Sanday in his book: 'One would like to think that the true site was *Khân Minyeh*. As I stood on the ruins of the *khân*, the landscape that stretched before my eyes was, I thought, the most beautiful that met them in the whole of Palestine. The contrast of the rich dark green of the plain with the bold precipices of *Wâdy et-Hamâm* rising straight in front, and fringed on the one side by the curving shore and on the other by the gently swelling uplands, was a thing not to be forgotten. It spoke of something more than the variety of nature. It hinted also at the infinite variety in the lives and characters of men. I had not realized that Capernaum was full in view of a famous haunt of robbers, a haunt perhaps also of desperate patriots. Among the peaceful fisher-folks and tillers of the soil, and among the gay coloured caravans of traders coming and going, there must have been felt the stress of sterner and fiercer passions; and such surroundings were a fit home for Him who came to seek and to save that which was lost.'

For beauty of situation *Khân Minyeh* has it. But beauty of situation does not settle it. Dr. Sanday does not use that as an argument. The site cannot be found by appealing to one's sentiment. And for that matter we do not lose the sentiment if we fix upon *Tell Hûm*; for the distance between the two places, we remember, is less than two miles. Besides the name, there is really only another argument that bears upon the question. It is the argument from the statements of early travellers.

Of these the first is Josephus. The words of Josephus are: 'Besides the good temperature of the air, it is also watered from a most fertilizing

fountain. The people of the country call it Capharnaum.' This fountain, as all agree, is '*Ain et-Tâbigha*. Now '*Ain et-Tâbigha* is nearer *Khân Minyeh* than *Tell Hâm*, say three-quarters of a mile from the former and a mile and quarter from the latter. More than that, the waters of *et-Tâbigha* could not be carried to the higher ground of *Tell Hâm* to water it; whereas the very aqueduct is still in existence which carried them to *Khân Minyeh* and the fertile plain behind. Josephus seems to favour the claim of *Khân Minyeh*, and even to decide the claim in its favour.

But only so long as we forget that when Josephus spoke of Capernaum he included the country round. The cities and large villages of Galilee were not bounded by a ring fence, but each had its territory, extending for some miles round the place itself. 'I have frequently pointed out,' says Professor Ramsay, 'in my *Historical Geography of Asia Minor*, examples of error caused by our assuming that a name means the actual town, when the ancient writer means the whole territory of the town.' In the language of Josephus 'Capharnaum' would cover '*Ain et-Tâbigha*, if Capernaum were *Tell Hâm*, and the springs of '*Ain et-Tâbigha*, though a mile and quarter away, would quite naturally be called 'the Fountain of Capharnaum.'

Only another witness is worth calling. It is Theodosius. 'From Tiberias to Magdala, where the lady Mary was born,' says Theodosius (530 A.D.), 'is two [Roman] miles. From Magdala to Seven Fountains [Heptapegon], where the Lord Christ baptized the apostles, is two miles, where he also fed the people with five loaves and two fishes. From Seven Fountains to Capharnaum is two miles.' Theodosius is wrong in his distance between Magdala and Seven Fountains, that is, '*Ain et-Tâbigha* or Heptapegon. The distance is more than two miles. But he is right in his estimate of the distance between Seven Fountains and Capernaum, if Capernaum was at *Tell Hâm*. And that it was at *Tell Hâm* was clearly his

opinion. For to speak of two miles from Seven Fountains to *Khân Minyeh* is impossible, and what is most important of all, *Khân Minyeh* is not so far on the way as Seven Fountains. If Theodosius meant *Khân Minyeh* when he spoke of Capernaum, he would have been turning back again, before he went on, as he afterwards did, to Bethsaida and to Panias.

To Professor Ramsay's mind Theodosius settles it. 'Theodosius came to Heptapegon, and moving on to the north, reached Capernaum. That class of argument is in my experience the most unshakable and safe to rest upon.' Dr. Sanday is also satisfied. He writes his article in the *Journal of Theological Studies* for the purpose of saying that his mind is at rest.

The complaint of the empty pew is old. For a little time now we have been hearing the complaint of the empty pulpit. Men are not coming forward to fill the pulpit. In every Protestant country there has been a falling off in the number of 'candidates for the Holy Ministry.'

What is the cause, and what is the remedy to be? A presbytery of the Church of Scotland—the Presbytery of Hamilton—has taken the matter into serious consideration, and has issued a 'Report.' The report is divided into two parts—Probable Causes and Suggested Remedies. It is most business-like and exhaustive. All the causes must be in it, and some of the remedies. We could not improve upon it. But if we might dare to condense it, we would say that men do not come forward as candidates now *either because preaching is no longer worth living by, or because it is no longer worth living for.*

Preaching is no longer worth living by. To the men who look upon it as one of the professions it has lost its attractiveness. The Presbytery of Hamilton makes that quite plain. The preparation is too long; the prospect of promotion is too

doubtful; the remuneration is too small. If we are to attract the men who want something to live by, we must shorten the curriculum, invent a system of 'translation,' and pay a living wage.

But preaching is also no longer worth living for. This is not the chief cause of the dearth of candidates, but it is the cause of the loss of the best candidates. We do not say that preaching ought not to be worth living by, but we do say that it ought always to be worth living for. It does not seem to be worth living for in our day.

There is no excitement in it. Men will sacrifice anything for excitement—money, reputation, comfort. Preachers are not wholly free from the love of a little excitement in their lives. They used to get it in conversion, but there are no conversions now. Some of them found it in the Church courts. There are those who still take their excitement in that way. But the Church courts furnish sufficient excitement to draw candidates for the ministry only when great movements are afloat. There are no great movements now. A 'Smith Heresy' is settled by a single vote. A Disruption is not due.

And there is no joy in it. The best men have always been above the necessity of living *by* their profession, but they must have a profession to live for. If it means self-denial they are ready for that. But there must be joy in the self-denial. The Free Churchmen in the 'forties, the High Churchmen in the 'seventies, took joyfully the spoiling of their goods. It does not matter what it means if there is joy in it. There is no joy in the Christian ministry now. Men dare not preach what they believe; there is no joy in that: or they take care not to believe what they dare not preach; and there is no joy in that.

Men dare not preach what they believe, or they take care not to believe what they dare not preach. Is that true? It does not matter whether it is true or not for what we are speaking about. We

are speaking about the dearth of candidates for the Holy Ministry. And it is enough that those young men who should become candidates—the best young men, who want something to live *for*—think that at the present time preachers dare not preach what they believe, or take care not to believe what they dare not preach.

The two things that men dare not preach are Evolution and the Higher Criticism. By Evolution is meant all that modern science has to say about the origin of man, the fact of sin, the fall, the future. By Higher Criticism is meant all that modern scholarship has to say about the Bible. But, we say in self-defence, our business is to preach the gospel. Neither Evolution nor the Higher Criticism is the gospel, and it is absurd to condemn us for not preaching what it is not our business to preach. That is true. But it is not a defence. We cannot preach the gospel without touching these things. The moment we touch them we are tested. The modern evolutionist may say that sin is simply self, its expression is the inevitable inheritance from our past ancestry. We cannot preach the gospel without touching sin. We either accept that estimate of sin or we reject it. Again, our message is in the Word. Is it possible for us to preach the gospel without showing what authority the written Word has upon us? If we conceal our mind on these things, or if on these things our mind is not at rest, then there is no joy in our preaching, and the young man who might have become a candidate for the Holy Ministry sees it.

The Headmaster of The Leys School, Cambridge, has published in the *Preacher's Magazine* for October a sermon on Heredity. His text is the text from which all heredity sermons are preached: 'What mean ye, that ye use this proverb concerning the land of Israel, saying, The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge? As I live, saith the Lord God, ye shall not have occasion any more to use this

proverb in Israel.' That is Ezekiel's form of it (18^{2, 3}). Either in that form or in Jeremiah's (31^{29, 30}) it is the heredity text always.

It is a text that seems to deny heredity. The denial is more emphatic in Jeremiah: 'But every one shall die for his own iniquity; every man that eateth the sour grapes, his teeth shall be set on edge.' The text has to be explained first by its occasion. If the prophets seem to deny heredity, it cannot be urged that they knew nothing of science. For evidently they and all Israel had got this scientific thought so well by heart that it stood as one of their popular proverbs. The question for these prophets was not, Do we inherit anything from our fathers, but Do we inherit everything? And they answered, We do not.

Israel was in captivity. The good had been carried away with the bad. The good suffered from the carrying away far more than the bad did. It was only the Israelite who delighted in the law of God who could resolve: 'If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget her cunning.' But it was a mistake of the good in Israel to blame their fathers or their ill-doing neighbours exclusively. The proverb was true, but it was too often on their lips. When the fathers eat sour grapes, the children's teeth *are* set on edge; but it is time for these captive Israelites to understand that the other side is true also. It is time for them to say, not only 'I dwell in the midst of a people of unclean lips,' but also 'I am a man of unclean lips.'

Heredity is true. 'The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge'—the proverb is quite true. But it is not the whole truth. The children's inheritance is something for the temptations of life to fasten upon. It may make life's temptations keener on this side or on that. But it does not give them their victory. Only the acquiescence of the will does that. And the will of the individual is his own.

Life is better for its temptations. It would be

a poor thing without its temptations. And temptation, to be a force in life, must be dangerous. Heredity gives temptation its opportunity of becoming dangerous. The drunkard's child is not born a drunkard, but he may be tempted intensely to drink. The strength of his character will be the greater because of the intensity of his temptation, if he resists the temptation. And he may resist the temptation. His will is his own.

But our hereditary inheritance is not all evil. Mr. Barber is wise to insist on that. It may be that the father was a drunkard, but the grandfather has also to be taken into account. And the great-grandfather. And you cannot stop there. Go on, says Mr. Barber. You speak as if the gutter child's heredity was only evil. Carry it back far enough, and what do you find? The poor, pale-faced, rickety, bow-legged child of the drunkard in the gutter—carry his ancestry back, carry it back far enough, and you find, 'which was the son of Adam, which was the son of God.'

That is quite scientific. Matthew's genealogy begins with Abraham, and you say that is provincial, that is Jewish. Well, Matthew wrote his gospel for Jews. But Luke begins with God. He wrote his gospel for all mankind, and he is thoroughly scientific. You may say that this first ancestor is too far away to affect the gutter child's heredity. Has science formed a table of heredity then? Can it tell the exact degree of each ancestor's influence? Has it discovered that the pressure of influence is in exact proportion to the nearness of relationship? Science has made no such discovery. It says no such thing. But it does say that an ancestor of strongly marked character will reappear in his far-off descendants, when the intermediate and colourless progenitors have left no impression. It is a long way to carry back the gutter child's ancestry, is it? But carry it back to God and you have an ancestor who made His impression.

For our inheritance is not all evil. 'Which was

the Son of God.' What does that mean? It means, says Mr. Barber, that in me, degraded and obscure as I may be, with all the evil tendency which went to make me, there is something hidden, a power of righteousness, a power of seeing right and wrong, a grand tendency to God. And he thinks that we might do worse than go to the drunkard who quotes the proverb, 'the fathers have eaten sour grapes,' and ask him to carry his doctrine of heredity all the way—'which was the son of God.'

And then heredity has a fellow. It is not all our possessions. Heredity is within. There is also a force that touches life from without. Mr. Barber recalls the plot of *Elsie Venner*, that story into which Oliver Wendell Holmes poured his whole philosophy of life. Elsie Venner's mother is bitten by a rattlesnake before the child

is born. The snake-nature enters somewhat into the nature of the child. She struggles with that inheritance till she reaches womanhood. Would she have won or would she have lost? We are not told. But we are told that she was not left to struggle alone. With womanhood there came from without the pure love of the young man for the maiden. His love enfolds her, fights for her, fights with her, and they win together. 'I have been stung,' says Mr. Barber, 'by the scorpion sin. It has been a life's struggle. All through life I have felt it. I feel it still. But love comes and love enfolds me. I could not do it alone, but when the glorious love comes from the Cross and is thrown around me, and I feel the thrill of that strong power within me, then I can do it. I can do all things through Christ, which strengtheneth me.'

The Spiritual Discipline of Science.

BY THE REV. J. CAMPBELL GIBSON, D.D., SWATOW.

'Lo, these are but the outskirts of His ways:
And how small a whisper do we hear of Him!
But the thunder of His power who can understand?'—Job xxvi. 14.

LIVING, as we do, in an age of science, we cannot escape the influences of our time. There may be dangers in these influences which we cannot avoid, but there are also elements of help and stimulus which we cannot afford to lose. These influences are not therefore to be deplored, but weighed and wisely used as a spiritual discipline for the perfecting of faith and the refining of Christian character.

When we were children we were told that the bread on our father's table was the gift of God. As we grew older we found that the bread came from the baker, that the baker had his flour from the miller, that the miller had his wheat from the farmer, and that the farmer got it by hard toil in ploughing and sowing. So in all directions in our later life God seems to hide Himself behind His works, until men begin to think that the more they know of other things the less can they know of God.

So in the history of intellectual growth. Men at first thought of God's intervention as direct

and immediate, and when they embarked on the scientific study of the world it was with the feeling that at every stage their researches would reveal to them God. At first, indeed, in such studies it seemed as if these hopes must be largely fulfilled. Beautiful adaptations, instances of design, marvellous correlations for beneficent purposes, immediately presented themselves, and men's conceptions of the power, the benevolence, and the wisdom of God were greatly enlarged.

But as these studies went more to the heart of things, unexpected difficulties arose.

One set of these difficulties was disconcerting when it first came into view, but has not proved to be of very permanent importance. It threatened to assail the authority of Scripture. God, speaking to men in the Scriptures, had of necessity accommodated His utterance to human thought and language. The references to His great works of creation and providence were made in the current

speech of those to whom He addressed Himself at the first. It was the language which all men everywhere have used, and which, with all our knowledge, we use still, assuming men's standpoint as resident on an apparently rigid earth, round which sun, moon, and stars appear to move. But when men like Galileo began to demonstrate the real movements of these bodies, and when it was found that the popular conceptions were far from the literal truth,—that the earth was but one among myriads of bodies, itself in constant and rapid motion,—then some minds were shaken by the thought that, if that be so, the language of Scripture also is inconsistent with the literal fact. At first attempts were made on the one side to crush the new philosophy, and on the other to stifle the old faith.

But in time wiser counsels prevailed. Men began to see that if God was to speak to them at all, even He must speak in their own language. If the infinite grace of His self-revelation to men was ever to enter into human life it must be by His stooping in gracious condescension to their low estate, constraining His expressions within the narrow limits of their thoughts. He would leave them in the meantime their imperfect conceptions of the mechanism of His universe, because only by condescending to do so could He gain their ear for His great revelation in the region of the moral and the spiritual. He would at all risks establish spiritual relations between Himself and His children, throwing open to them at once the spiritual world, in the knowledge of which was the life of their souls; and He would be content to leave to them, as a fine intellectual discipline, the discovery for themselves of the profoundly interesting, but far less vital, truths of the natural mechanism of His glorious working in material things.

Precisians and pedants might scorn the popular language of common men, but the invisible God, as later the incarnate Christ, felt it sufficient for the purposes of His grace.

As some recognition of these things entered into men's minds they began to perceive that when God spake to them as to sons He necessarily left many things unsaid, and in things which did not touch vital spiritual issues He conformed to their own childish speech. For the time the fear of collision between faith in Scripture and scientific theories of the universe was allayed. Men saw

that a Scripture which spoke of the sun as rising and setting, and of the earth as the centre of things, was none the less a trustworthy revelation of God and of His great salvation in Jesus Christ. The new thoughts of science were accepted, and still the Bible stood fast as God's authoritative voice to men in spiritual things.

Again, in living memory the old fears were aroused at the birth of the modern science of geology. The record of the rocks had not remained till then wholly unread. But it was now read with fresh interest and with a more earnest scrutiny. Vast worlds of life and vast spaces of prehistoric time came into view. Strange orders of beings in marvellous succession linked forgotten eras with our own time. Soon men began to contrast the enormous scale, both in space and time, of these intricate processes of development with the simple conceptions of the supposed history of life in our world which they had hitherto been carrying in their minds. These simple conceptions, again, they had read into their Bible, and fancied they had derived them from it. Again the cry was raised that science and religion were at variance; that geology had challenged Genesis, and that men must choose between scientific truth and Christian faith as between two irreconcilable alternatives. But once more a calmer temper at last prevailed. On second thoughts it became apparent that the old preconceptions which gave a simple account of the history of life were only the natural conjectures of the childhood of humanity, and had no divine warrant in the revelation of God. Men had indeed, in the days of their pupilage, read the Book of Genesis in the narrow sense which alone their minds were then able to grasp. But now they began to see that they had too narrowly interpreted God. It was they themselves who had made the apparent contradiction. When the majestic utterances of the earlier Scriptures were read again in the new light it began to appear that the God who had spoken to prophets and patriarchs was speaking with the same voice in the opened record of the rocks. His interpreters had been put to shame, but not He Himself. Faith was not silenced or overthrown, but was taught to read God's Word more humbly, to interpret it with a more open mind, and to recognize deep answering to deep in the word and the works of God.

Again the new truths of science were accepted,

and yet the record of God's loving care in creation and providence stood fast. God reveals Himself in many ways, and each has its appropriate record. It was not that the two records were reconciled. Rather it was seen that they had never been at variance, and that the apparent discrepancy had been due only to the hasty misreading of men. Genesis and geology had each of them a message, harmonious and helpful to the growing minds of God's children.

Such were some of the phases of what used to be called 'the conflict of Science and Religion.' A book was published under that most misleading title, but, believe me, there is no such conflict. The time has surely for ever gone by when some men thought the meeting of the British Association a fit time for a blast against the Christian faith, and others took occasion for a counterblast in reply.

Behold how good and how pleasant it is
For brethren to dwell in unity!

Let that be our motto, whether as men of science or as men of faith.

Revelation and nature, theology and physical science, are our guiding lights in two great departments of life, and these are not lights that neutralize each other. They reinforce each other, and each has its discipline for the soul. He who follows the one with manly patience and modesty may at the same time follow the other in reverence and godly fear.

But while I deny the existence of the alleged conflict between the two great departments of our intellectual and our spiritual life, I fully recognize the growing difficulty of rightly adjusting their relations to each other. But the difficulty is no longer of the old kind. It is now far more serious, deeper, wider, more far-reaching, more vital in its issues.

It is no longer, as in the two instances of which I have spoken, that a few of the facts in some particular department of science seem, or even are, inconsistent with certain words or passages of Scripture. To continue to deal with questions on the borders of science and religion as if they were still of this nature is to mistake the situation altogether. The day of compromises, partial explanations, and petty reconciliations is past.

The difficulty now is that the whole mental attitude of men has changed. We may thank God

that the old vulgar infidelity, with its cheap sneers, has disappeared from literature and from serious discussion. It is not extinct, but it has to content itself with a lower and narrower platform. It now discredits, in the eyes of thinking men, any cause with which it seeks to associate itself.

What we have to face now is a wholly different experience. Modern education, social forces, and the pervasive influence of the scientific temper, have changed the whole atmosphere in which both our intellectual and our spiritual life is lived. Men no longer bow readily to authority. In all departments of study questions long closed are reopened and freshly investigated. Habits and methods of study originally adopted for the investigation of material things are applied to the study of history, psychology, ethics, and religion. We have, in consequence, not merely results in the shape of new facts and conclusions, in view of which we have to readjust our statements of belief, but new impressions and experiences which change our whole intellectual outlook, and are absorbed into the very fibre and substance of our religious thinking and our spiritual life. It is not only that the times have changed; we ourselves have changed with them.

Are these changes, then, for good or evil? I know that to many devout minds they seem a lost, unmixed evil. Such minds deplore the disappearance of old landmarks and bulwarks of the faith, and they fear that, in the new and shifting scenes on which we have entered, the old certainty of assured faith will never again be possible to us. One sympathizes with these apprehensions, but we ought not to give way to them. 'Say not thou, What is the cause that the former days were better than these? for thou dost not enquire wisely concerning this.'

I am anxious, on the contrary, to urge upon you the conviction that science, in all its variety, so far from being a foe to Christian faith, is furnishing a splendid discipline, not only for the intellect, but for religious and spiritual life.

It wonderfully enlarges our thoughts of God. It teaches us to look at His works as did the Hebrew poet of our text, and in view of all that it has shown us, to use with tenfold meaning his devout words of wonder—

Lo, these are but the outskirts of His ways:

And how small a whisper do we hear of Him!

In enlarging our knowledge science, has at the

same time, intensified a hundredfold our sense of our own ignorance, and how fine a discipline is that for the human spirit!

But how comes it that there is an impression that science, and especially physical science, is peculiarly self-satisfied, confident, and aggressive, not only speaking with authority in its own domain, but claiming, by its rash *obiter dicta*, to pronounce on questions of faith and spiritual experience, as if it were sole master of human thought? It must be admitted that there have been men, not a few, calling themselves men of science, who have loved to play this unlovely part. But these are to be criticised, not as men hostile to Christian faith, but rather as men who have been disloyal to science itself. Science revenges herself upon them, for such men never reach her seats of highest honour nor hold rank with her immortals.

The great makers of science have been men of another type, and have learned humility and self-restraint as the first lessons of their craft. When a man sets himself to unravel some one of the mysteries of physical nature, he tries by observation, by experiment, by theoretical reasoning from the known to the unknown, to push gradually back the boundaries of knowledge. He spends weeks and months in unrewarded toil, and counts himself happy if at the last he can bring back out of the shadowy realm of the unknown one fact or bit of truth,—happier still if what he has brought is a hint or clue to the discovery of a law, or a key to some hitherto closed pathway of research.

All this teaches a man modesty, patience, self-restraint, and perseverance, with a readiness to endure boundless labour as the price of one morsel of truth.

In my student days I had the privilege of receiving a lesson of this kind under the direction and inspiration of a prince of science. A friend and myself were set to investigate one single phase of one physical property of a single substance. At first it seemed to us, I suppose, that the task might fill up the spare hours of a week or two. But week followed week, month followed month, and some three years were gone before the result was attained and the determination reached. Our great chief directed our work with unwearied persistence and endless resource, and when the result was gained gave to us the whole credit of it. So we had for three years before us a living example of the patience, persistency, resource,

modesty, and generosity of the true scientific spirit; and we received for ourselves something of the discipline involved in such researches. It was one of the best parts of our preparation for our work on the mission field.

But it is the men who give their lives to scientific research who reap the full fruit of its discipline. They not only gather facts,—they co-ordinate them as laws, and interlink them in chains of causation. So there grows before their minds a world of infinite and complex beauty. There is nothing random in it, nothing of the waywardness of human will, nothing of the unreason of human perversity, of the weakness or the audacity of human sin. All is ordered, calm, and abiding. So, in this school of God, men learn veracity and humility, and are bowed down before the majesty, the beauty, and the complex harmony of the thoughts of God. Men may, through their own fault, fail to receive these impressions, but assuredly the lessons of science are not irreverence or captious unbelief, but reverence, humility, and faith.

Lord Kelvin's is, without rival, the greatest name in the science of our day, and he has recently expressed the mature convictions of his life in a memorable utterance. He said—

He could not say that, with regard to the origin of life, science neither affirmed nor denied creative power. Science positively affirmed creative power. Science made everyone feel a miracle in himself. It was not in dead matter that they lived and moved and had their being, but in the creative power which science compelled them to accept as an article of belief. They could not escape from that when they studied the physics and dynamics of living and dead matter all around. . . . They only knew God in His works, but they were absolutely forced by science to admit and to believe with absolute confidence in a directive power—in an influence other than physical, dynamical, electrical forces. Cicero had denied that they could have come into existence by a fortuitous concourse of atoms. There was nothing between absolute scientific belief in creative power and the acceptance of the theory of a fortuitous concourse of atoms. Was there anything so absurd as to believe that a number of atoms, by falling together of their own accord, could make a sprig of moss, a microbe, or a living animal? People thought that, given millions of years, these might come to pass, but they could not think that a million of millions of millions of years could give them, unaided, a beautiful world like ours. They had a spiritual influence, and in science a knowledge that there was that influence in the world around them.

A few days later he added, in a supplementary letter, the following:—

I desired to point out that, while 'fortuitous concourse of atoms' is not an inappropriate description of the forma-

tion of a crystal, it is utterly absurd in respect to the coming into existence, or the growth, or the continuation of the molecular combinations presented in the bodies of living things. Here science is compelled to accept the idea of creative power. Forty years ago I asked Liebig, walking somewhere in the country, if he believed that the grass and flowers which we saw around us, grew by mere chemical forces. He answered, 'No, no more than I could believe that a book of botany describing them could grow by mere chemical forces.' Every action of human freewill is a miracle to physical and chemical and mathematical science.

It is strange that the idea should have gone abroad that science itself or men of science are hostile to Christian faith. The really creative minds in the first rank of scientific work have usually, in our own country at least, been believers in God. It has not been their habit, nor perhaps their duty, to make large public professions of their faith. But when a list is made of the greatest names,—not popular exponents of the second rank, but the men of original formative minds, like Newton and Herschell, Faraday, Clerk Maxwell and Stokes, and others who were their fellow-workers and worthy to rank with them,—it is a list of men who one and all were reverent believers. Darwin is often spoken of as the father of all those who, in the name of science, assail Christian faith. But Darwin did no such thing. He both began and ended his great book, *The Origin of Species*, with a clear profession, the more weighty because it is almost unconscious, of his belief in a Divine Creator.

The graces of the Christian life have never shone more brightly than in the lives of Faraday and Clerk Maxwell, and there is no sweeter or more inspiring record of the calm and beauty of a saintly death than the touching story of Maxwell's last days.

Without the quickening Word and Spirit of the living God all else is vain, but where these are, the pursuits of science have a singular power to elevate and purify and strengthen the soul. The daily work of the scientific man is, as a great philosopher has said, to think out and to think over the thoughts of God. This daily effort ought, surely, to bring a man nearer and nearer to his God. And how pleasing to the Father heart of God must be the efforts of His children to learn His thoughts and trace His ways, and to recognize, with loving adoration, the operation of His hands!

I have spoken of difficulties in the relations of science to faith, difficulties of growing complexity and seriousness, and have indicated how, on the

other hand, some of the operations of science become the means of discipline to heart and soul. But there is another aspect of the difficulty of faith in our time, which specially needs to be noted. Our God is a God who hideth Himself.

He hides Himself so wondrously,
As though there were no God!
He is least seen when all the powers
Of ill are most abroad.

Or to quote again from this Book of Job—

Behold, I go forward, but He is not there;
And backward, but I cannot perceive Him:
On the left hand, when He doth work, but I cannot
behold Him:
He hideth Himself on the right hand, that I cannot
see Him.

This elusiveness of God is a great spiritual difficulty. It was hoped at first, as I have said, that science would reveal and explain God. What has been on the whole the result? Does it not seem sometimes as if God were farther off than ever? In the childhood of our race God seemed to be near. He was working behind a thin veil, which an effort would presently pierce and rend, and so, through the study of nature, God would stand revealed. Experience has disappointed this hope. On the contrary, the phenomena of nature have been traced back to physical causes, and each physical cause again has been traced to some remoter cause, and this to others remoter still. It is as if veil after veil has been lifted, and still we do not find God.

The chain of causation has been enormously lengthened. Its links have become more and more numerous and subtle, until men begin to think that matter is its own explanation, and that behind it all there is no room and no need for God. Nature is explained by chemistry and physics, the Bible by archæology and criticism, Religion by anthropology and history. All that once seemed but the vesture of a present God has been emptied of its divine content and significance, and nature is the explanation of nature. This is the difficulty and the trial of faith in our day. Unbelievers rejoice in the sweeping away of what they regard as moribund superstitions. Believers, uneasy and impatient, cry out, 'They have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid Him.' It seems as if unbelief were more bold, and faith less courageous than ever before.

Brethren, be assured these are but nightmares.

of the passing hour, the weariness and impatience of a restless race, who feel well-nigh overwhelmed by the growing multiplicity of the objects of their knowledge.

Science has not emptied the world of God. It has taught us that the links of causation are far more numerous, far more subtle and refined than we had supposed, but it has done nothing to shake our assurance that no physical cause, however remote, can ever be the final cause of physical phenomena. A physical cause is of necessity a physical effect, and when we reach it it tells us by its very nature that it is not yet the end. The chain of causes is longer than we had supposed, but by the thrills of beneficent power that reach us through it we still know in our hearts that its farthest link, however far, is held in the hand of power, and controlled by the heart of love, of the living God. The steps which lead us to the footstool of His throne are far more wonderful and numerous than our fathers knew or we surmised. They seem now to rise up into cloudy regions where sight fails us, and even faith falters, but beyond them all the footstool still stands firm, and the eternal throne is unshaken.

This, then, is the supreme difficulty of faith which science has created for us. Physical facts have so multiplied, and physical laws have so encompassed us, that it is hard to remember that all these things are but the outskirts of God's ways, and that all this intricacy of physical things leaves the world of spirits as open and free as ever.

The difficulty is real and pressing, but it is not a mere barren difficulty, a danger only to be deplored. Nor is it a device of the enemy to rob us of our faith, nor a lamentable and fatal necessity of an advanced age. Nay, it is a great discipline, in which God deals with us as with children, to provoke us to a more strenuous search after Himself. 'This also cometh forth from the Lord of Hosts, who is wonderful in counsel and excellent in working.'

When we recognize that our difficulty is but part of a great discipline which He has ordered for us, the bitterness of this experience is already gone, and in patience we learn to possess our souls. When men trace for us the causation of the phenomena of nature, and carry us back from cause to cause, in apparently endless succession, we shall not lose heart and faith as if God were shut out. We shall only say that God, then, is greater than we knew. There is no searching of His understanding. He is not like some bungling mechanician, compelled to stand by his own defective work with key and lever to help out its action, to expedite here and retard there, ever watchful and active to avert imminent disaster. That is not the likeness of our God. His work is perfect, and part of its perfection lies here, that, while in its ordered course it reveals Him to those who look for Him, it also by its ease and sureness hides Him from those who desire not the knowledge of His ways.

God leaves men free to disbelieve, but the God who hides Himself so wondrously is a God also who reveals Himself to longing souls. To the great philosopher, as to the little child, or the common man, He makes Himself known, not in mighty marvels of created things, but by the whispers of His own Spirit to ours; and in Jesus Christ, His Son, flesh of our flesh, who dwelt among us for our redemption, and died for us on His cross, God has revealed the love of His inmost heart. Let our hearts but listen to that voice, and answer to that love, and then, assured of our God and of His love, we shall willingly consent to the sore and long training by which He is testing our faith, enlarging our thoughts of Him, and preparing that disciplined and glorified manhood which in higher worlds and vaster ages yet to come, shall set forth to all orders of being the manifold wisdom of God, and fulfil for Him ministries of service which as yet are inconceivable to us.

'Now I know in part; but then shall I know even as also I have been known.'

Recent Foreign Theology.

Christian Work of Women in the Early Church.¹

THIS special study of early Church life is dedicated to Harnack in respectful gratitude by one of his pupils in whom he had 'kindled love to science.' The subject is a scientific inquiry into the official rank and work of women in Christian service in the first centuries of the Church. Some interesting preliminary questions are first discussed. On the general position of women in antiquity we need only refer to the last chapters of Lecky's *History of European Morals*. On their position in Christianity two opposing points of view are found in Paul and the early Fathers. Zscharnack sees only a dogmatic prejudice in the assertion that woman owes to Christianity the recognition of her true dignity, on the ground that the later Jewish view of woman, at least in such passages as Gn 2¹⁸ and the Song of Songs, was not improved upon in Christianity, while in 1 Co 11^{3, 7} woman is not directly possessed of the image of God. But, of course, the true Christian principle is given in Gal 3²⁸, as Z. agrees. Paul's references to marriage in 1 Co 7 are not due to any contempt for it, but are owing to the 'present distress': the world was soon to pass away, and the cares involved in marriage were a distraction to be avoided. The same eschatological tone appears in Tertullian in the same connexion. It is true that an ascetic spirit was abroad in those centuries, founded, however, not on hostility to the female sex, but on the purely metaphysical theory of dualism. The apocryphal *Acts of Apostles* were a veritable propaganda of asceticism in regard to marriage (cf. 'Blessed are those who have wives as though they had them not: for they shall become angels of God,' in *Acta Pauli et Theclæ*); but abstinence from marriage was not a characteristic of early Christianity. Not to refer to Jesus' teaching (in which Mt 19 does not require such abstinence), Paul does not consider marriage a sin (1 Co 7^{28, 29}); and in 1 Tim 4³ forbidding to marry is counted heretical. The Church, as dis-

tingent from Encratites and Gnostics, held to the better view. Says Hermas, 'In always remembering thy wife, thou shalt never sin.' Christianity, then, approved marriage: did it set a new value thereon? Z. points to the two facts that Greece and Rome had prepared the way for the emancipation of woman, and that Christianity did not succeed in removing immediately and everywhere the antique view (again compare Lecky). We must confess that low motives are sometimes introduced in connexion with marriage, as in 1 Co 7², 1 Th 4^{4, 5}; and 1 Co 11¹¹, though very fine, stands in a very remarkable context. Everywhere there is a confused uncertainty of view. Tertullian expresses both the lower and the higher rationale of marriage. Marriage is *solemnē sexuum officium*, a *spiritale consortium* in the life to come, and now a 'union of two believers in one hope, one discipline, and the same service.' This, from the misogynist who said marriage was a hindrance in the way of worshipping God, and mockingly replied when the useful virtues of a wife were praised to him: *Scilicet solis maritorum domibus est bene*. Clement of Alexandria has the honour of being the first to thoroughly apply the Christian and moral conceptions. Asceticism, he held, is not holier than marriage; there is even a duty to marry; and he gives a beautiful turn to the familiar text (Mt 18²⁰): 'Who are the two or three who are gathered together in Christ's name, and in whose midst the Lord is? Is it not husband and wife and child?' Indeed, Clement is so earnest in the matter that we may suspect a polemical purpose. Paul is typical for the twofold attitude: 'In him two views are found in germ; one, more out of sight, and seldom taken account of by the ancient teachers, which develops the specifically Christian thought (1 Co 7¹⁴ 11¹¹, Gal 3²⁸), and which, if consistently carried through, could not but have destroyed the other view; the other, according to which woman has the divine image only at second-hand, and represents a humanity of the second order (1 Co 11^{3, 7}), is the antique idea which fails to recognize the moral personality of woman, and must open a chasm between man and woman.' In regard to Paul's attitude, Z. overlooks the great practical difficulties of the woman question in such a place

¹ *Der Dienst der Frau in den ersten Jahrhunderten der christlichen Kirche*. Von Leopold Zscharnack, Lic. Theol. Göttingen, 1902. Glasgow: F. Bauermeister.

as Corinth, on which there are some good remarks in Dobschütz, *Urchristliche Gemeinden*, p. 33 ff.

The next preliminary question is easier. The attitude of woman to Christianity must have helped greatly to raise her position. The services rendered by women to Jesus influenced men's minds. On the part they played at the Resurrection, Hippolytus exclaims, 'Eve now is become Adam's helper.' Z. has a very interesting section giving a selection of facts about the services of women in the early missions of the Church. The success of the Jews with women was a prelude to the immense conquests made by Christianity among them. Celsus mocked at success gained with uneducated slaves, children, and *women*, though he acknowledged that among these women were many gentle and high-born. The N.T. is full of the names of Christian women, and the early legends tell us more. According to the *Acta Pauli et Theclæ*, the men cried out against Paul as the 'magician who brings all our women to destruction'; while the women were full of sympathetic terror when Thecla was bound to the lion. Z. is right in saying that stories like this are typical, and have in them a strain of historical truth in representing the women—and these, too, of the higher ranks—as the first to be converted, and as the real fosterers of the gospel. In actual history we meet with Pomponia Græcina ('*superstitionis externæ rea*,' Tacitus), wife of the consular A. Plautius of Nero's day; and Flavia Domitilla, the wife of Domitian's relative, the consul Flavius Clemens; while Tertullian speaks of *clarissimæ feminae* under Septimius Severus. In the reign of Elagabalus, Callistus, bishop of Rome, ventured to pronounce valid marriages between senators' daughters and men of lower rank, which were null in Roman law, but evidently were likely to occur when both parties were Christians. Julia Mammæa, mother of the noble-minded emperor, Alexander Severus, 'seems to have helped towards christianizing the imperial throne, just as much as the winning of the better families was a work of women' (p. 27). Z., rightly conceiving that the attitude of women to Christianity comes out most clearly in what they were ready to suffer, goes into the very interesting question of the female martyrs, and collects together all the historical cases he can find. The result of their devoted loyalty must have been their receiving a recog-

nition and position in the Church of which theory never dreamed.

The third preliminary question forms the transition to the proper subject of the book, and is headed, 'Principles of the Constitution of the Early Christian Church.' Z. follows the view of Loening. In the first days there was no official organization. The spirit ruled, not law, and all were priests. Z. seems to think that as soon as officials appeared, the general priesthood of believers came to an end. This is surely to stretch unduly the idea of sacerdotalism. Of sacerdotalism in any true sense there was no trace during the greater part of the second century, though there were officers from its beginning, and before it. As Lindsay says, we hear 'much about the sacredness of order, nothing about the sanctity of orders.' But Z. says that when the time of the charismata ended, the thought of universal priesthood became a theory of which nothing was seen in practice. By this he means that in the first age it was open to all to teach, baptize, and preside at the Lord's Supper. This is not the place to criticize this view. When the laity lost their rights, the women (of laic rank?) lost theirs also.

Zscharnack discusses the service of women first in the 'great Church,' and then outside it in Gnosticism and Montanism. Under the former heading he treats first of woman as teacher and prophetess; then of the sacerdotal functions of women; and, thirdly, of 'widows and deaconesses.'

Many women are named with all honour in the N.T., and some of them must have been prominent. But did they teach? The work of Euodia and Syntyche (Ph 4^{2, 3}, 'laboured with me *in the gospel*') seems to imply teaching, and τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν ἐν κυρίῳ would suggest that the good ladies were teaching different doctrines. But even with the addition ἐν κυρίῳ the phrase surely has its usual sense (2 Co 13³, Ph 2²). The case of Priscilla is more interesting. As her name generally comes before her husband's, it is supposed by Z. and Harnack that she was the chief person in the mission work done by the two. Harnack (following Chrysostom) believes that Priscilla was the teacher of Apollos (Ac 18²⁶), and Z. thinks it is probable that she wrote the letter of commendation on his behalf to Corinth (Ac 18²⁷). If she was the instrument of the conversion of Apollos, 'how important must she

have been when she knew how to bring over to her faith the speculative Alexandrine scholar' (Harnack). This is all conjectural; and much more doubtful is Harnack's latest theory, that Priscilla was the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, which was addressed to Roman Christians. Z. would fain believe it, as it would settle the question of women teachers in the earliest Church, but has to confess that a convincing proof is not forthcoming. Harnack himself heads his article on the subject, *Probabilia*. When all is so doubtful, it is going too far to say: 'Priscilla alone is sufficient to teach us that there was not forbidden, and on the moral ground of gratitude could not be forbidden, to the female missionary teaching work in congregations already founded, and even authority in outside congregations' (p. 55).

In regard to prophecy, Z. dwells on the enthusiastic character of early Christianity, and on the prominence of women in all similar movements in history. We may instance the Salvation Army. There were without doubt prophetesses in early Christianity, and the early Christian view placed them in line with the O.T. ones. The *Apostolic Constitutions* (viii. 2) enumerates Miriam, Deborah, Huldah, Judith, the Mother of the Lord, Elisabeth, Anna, and ἐφ' ἡμῶν αἱ Φιλίππου θυγατέρες. Another prophetess, Ammia of Philadelpia (perhaps of time of Hadrian), is named, but we know no others. As these are the only names produced in all references to female prophets, Weizsäcker concludes that the flourishing state of prophecy in early times was more a dogma than a fact based on concrete instances; but Z. thinks there must have been a large number whose names are lost, again going rather beyond the evidence. The *Apostolic Canons* (near the end of second century) speak of three 'widows,' of whom, as Lindsay puts it, 'one is nurse and Biblewoman in one, the other two persevere in prayer for the tempted, and pray for new revelations'—a strange relic of the charismatic prophecy. But what is Paul's attitude towards female prophets? He seems to take them for granted in 1 Co 11⁵, while insisting on their being veiled. What then does he mean in 1 Co 14^{34, 35}, where he forbids women λαλεῖν? Holsten and Schmiedel strike out the latter passage; but Z. prefers to follow Seeberg in making a distinction between προφητεύειν and λαλεῖν, the latter referring to the conversational

criticism which followed a prophetic address. The apostle thought it unseemly in a woman to take part. I think that Dobschütz (*l.c.* p. 35) is as nearly correct as any. The women in Corinth were 'emancipated,' and Paul first insists on their being veiled in the assembly for worship, at least if they came forward to pray or prophesy. But the question reaches a further stage: may women speak at all? 1 Co 14³⁶ suggests that the prominent part taken by women was a peculiarity of the Corinthian Church. 'Doubtless Paul with the strict prohibition introduces an innovation in the *Corinthian* practice, a sharpening of discipline to which the dangerous tendency impelled him. So he first looks upon prayer and prophecy by women as correct, then forbids them all speaking in the assembly.' Is it wrong to suppose that Paul may have been undecided on the question, and, though he may have granted the principle, was alarmed at the way in which the Corinthian ladies put it into practice? Z. inclines to the somewhat too obvious solution that Paul forbade speaking only to the women who had no charisma. 1 Ti 2¹² contains a direct prohibition in regard to διδάσκειν; but for Z. this Epistle belongs to a later age. He infers from the polemic against them (cf. old canon: *mulier quamvis docta et sancta viros in conventu docere non præsumat*) that the women made many attempts to be recognized as teachers, and brings the prohibition into connexion with the great movement of clericalism against lay service. But were there no 'clerical' women to whom the charismatic gift of speaking might have descended? There were, indeed, 'widows' and deaconesses, but theirs was a different kind of service. In Tit 2^{3, 4} certain πρεσβυτίδες were to teach the young women; and in the fourth century we hear of women who had the duty of instructing ignorant peasant women to prepare them for baptism. The circle of the taught in both these cases was very narrow. Z. believes there was a long history of struggle for equality with men in the first period on the part of lay women charismatically endowed, who claimed the right of public work. In the later period the clerical women desired to keep the modest right allowed her of teaching within a narrow circle, but the Church took everything from her except the right of mission work and the patronage of the house-congregation, for a missionary Church could not dispense with the help of women.

The next section takes up the right of women to baptize. *Thecla* alone can be appealed to, and some *Acts of Martyrs*. 'Scarcely ever, and probably never, except in the case of heretics,' is Z.'s conclusion; but this does not exclude efforts on their part to obtain this right. Z. is a confirmed defender of women's rights, and seems to think, like some advocates of the same in modern days, that the women were greatly concerned about the matter. The Syriac *Testamentum Domini Nostri* of the fourth or fifth century gives the clerical widows the duty of anointing the baptized women. Was this possibly a survival from the former practice of performing the whole ceremony? But the silence of the oldest authorities and a veto of Tertullian stand against the affirmative judgment of *Thecla* and the *Acts of Martyrs*. There is even less certainty in regard to the Lord's Supper. Epiphanius held, οὐδαμοῦ γυνὴ ἱεράτευσεν. He is not a good authority; yet, though Z. doubts it, he is probably correct enough in this matter.

We come now to 'widows' and 'deaconesses.' Unfortunately the authorities are few, so that Z.'s very interesting construction of the history is not perhaps quite established. First, he makes a rapid run through the available evidence. In the N.T. we have the passage 1 Ti 5³⁻¹⁶ (cf. also Tit 2³) on widows. The conditions attached to their enrolment imply duties, and the early Fathers saw in the passage the apostolic law for the clerical widowhood. In 1 Ti 3¹¹ deaconesses are meant. In the second century there were two classes of widows, the needy and the official class. There are no clerical widows in Ignatius. Clement (Alex.), Origen, and Tertullian know of only one clerical class of women, the widows. There are virgins, but they do not belong to the clergy. In Cyprian the widows are no longer officials, but subjects of the Church's charity. The Clementine writings, besides bishop, twelve presbyters, and deacons, mention an *ordo viduarum*. In the third and fourth century the original *Didascalia* knew of deaconesses; but the widow also appears as an official, but with no duties. In the part of the *Apost. Const.* founded on the *Didascalia* only the deaconess is ordained; widows and virgins hold no office. But in the Canons of Hippolytus prayer is offered over widows (no laying on of hands), and deaconesses are not mentioned. Epiphanius names the three classes of widows, virgins, and deaconesses; but

the last only are official, and are to be chosen out of the two former, and in case of necessity even from ascetic married women. The *Test. Dom.* (as above), which belongs to the Monophysites, has both widows and deaconesses; but it stands alone in that age. In the West there is no office of women at all: Jerome knows of deaconesses, but only in the East. So, then, the two classes come together only in 1 Ti and the *Test. Dom.*, and between the two in the *Didascalia*, where, however, the widow has no office. The duties of widows were prayer, visiting the poor and the sick, and a certain moral supervision or pastoral work. The *Didascalia* forbids the latter in a polemic tone. In 1 Ti the widows seem to form a body with supervision over the female part of the congregation, and had the care of orphans (hence the condition ἐτεκνοτρόφησεν). The deaconesses, on the other hand, had certain duties at the public worship, but the *Didascalia* gives pastoral duties to them. There is an element of doubt here. Z. thinks the arrangement in *Didascalia* abnormal. Where the two classes appear separately, their duties are different. Works of charity belong to the widows, not to the deaconesses, who were officials at the public worship—kept the doors by which the women entered, maintained order amongst them, and showed women strangers to seats; also helped at the baptism of women.

We ask why the office of widow was abolished? Achelis assigns as cause Montanism and the too prominent place in it of women; but deaconesses were still appointed. Uhlhorn speaks of the contempt for married life and hence for widows; but deaconesses did not succeed to the office of the widows, and later (so Epiphanius) were even chosen from among widows. Z. seems near the truth in bringing the great reform in Church organization (seen by comparing Tertullian with Cyprian) into play. The hierarchical and sacerdotal spirit would not allow women to stand on an equality with men in priestly service. Perhaps the abuses connected with the pastoral work of widows (we read of their greediness and their gossiping) helped to make the change welcome. Whence the rise of deaconesses in the East? Z. suggests for Syria the high value put on virginity, and the desire to give them some definite work. Where the widows existed, this could not be pastoral service, but something else. Owing, however, to the extraordinary fact of the presence of

deaconesses all over the East by the end of the third century, we must find the reason in some felt need of the public worship. The office disappeared again before long because of the danger of the deaconesses marrying. Public feeling held this to be a breaking of their marriage with Christ, and one of Justinian's laws threatens with death any deaconess who married. 'Monasticism, which in its beginning had led to the foundation of the office of deaconess, at the climax of its development swallowed its own offspring, which had ceased to please, for it seemed worldly, and was too much exposed to the dangers of the world' (p. 151). 'Early Christianity and the ancient Church both were ready to legitimate the service of woman and to use her for the building up of the Church and for the planting of the kingdom of love; then came heresy, hierarchy, monasticism, which choked the seed' (p. 156).

I cannot do more than refer to the interesting pages on woman in Gnosticism, in all the different sects of which women played a most important rôle (Philumene was really foundress of the sect nominally under Apelles); and in Montanism, whose prophetesses, Maximilla and Priscilla, had more weight than Montanus himself. These three women excite our author's intense admiration, and he assigns them a place among the heroines of the history of Christianity.

JAMES CROSKERY.

Omagh.

Holzinger's 'Numbers.'¹

THE two strong points of this work are its textual criticism and its investigation of the sources which have combined to form our present Book of Numbers.

As to the former, two examples will suffice. The first is furnished by 5⁸⁻¹⁰, where some critics follow the lead of the LXX *ἐσται* (Pesh. *נִסְתָּן*). Holzinger writes: 'לִיהוָה לְבָנָהּ', with or without the correction *יְהוָה*, must signify "it belongs ideally to Yahweh, but actually to the priest." Dillmann refers to Lv 23¹⁰, but since the symbolic act there presupposed, which brings out this idea, is here omitted, we cannot but inquire whether לִיהוָה is

¹ *Numeri*. Erklärt von Lic. Dr. H. Holzinger. Tübingen u. Leipzig: J. C. B. Mohr, 1903.

not a miswriting for יְהוָה. . . . Nothing can be done with *אֲשֶׁר יִקְרִיבוּ לְבָנָהּ לֹא יְהוָה* is a ritual presentation, not to the priest, but to God. Moreover, it does not mean "to bring as a present to God," but "but to bring near to Him in a ritual act" (either without closer definition, as Lv 1⁸, or with the addition 'לִפְנֵי ה' Lv 3¹² אֶל-הַמִּזְבֵּחַ Nu 5²⁵).

The LXX and M.T. both corrected the original abstract term, *יִקְרִיבוּ*, the former by adding *καὶ ὑποτίθη*, the latter by adding *לוֹ* and connecting *לְבָנָהּ* with *יִקְרִיבוּ*, instead of with *יְהוָה*. The verse simply says that all dues paid to the sanctuary,—exclusive, of course, of offerings for sacrifice,—every kind of sacred gift brought by the Israelites, shall be the priests' property. . . . The text of v.¹⁰ cannot be translated. The omission of v.^{10b} by LXX Luc. may be due to despair of dealing with it. There is a way out of the difficulty—the deletion of *לֹא יְהוָה*

(Vulg. *om*!); what remains will then be no longer an anacoluthon, and will give the good sense, "and as to the private man's gifts, as each one brings them to the priest, to the priest shall they belong." The second example is found in the discussion of the impossible word *הַקֶּהֱל* (15¹⁵). 'Dillmann and Strack look on *הַקֶּהֱל* as a *casus pendens* to *לָכֵם* *וְלִפְנֵי הַזֶּה*, but this would be an intolerably hard construction. We may conjecture that *הַקֶּהֱל* is the gloss of a pedant who was perhaps thinking of v.²⁶, but was not in perfect agreement with the *usus loquendi* in other passages (see Lv 4¹⁸), and thought that the natives (*הָעֶרְבָּה*) and the foreigners together made up *this* whole.'

One of the most striking features in the analysis is the clearness with which the distinction is traced between the original stratum of P (P^s) and the additions successively made to that code of laws (P^s). Take, for instance, the comparison of chaps. 3 and 4. 'Chap. 4 is an altogether secondary development of chap. 3, and that in a twofold direction. First, the fundamental idea of chap. 1, that only those who were capable of active service were to be numbered in every tribe, is here taken up again, after being expunged from chap. 3 by P^s or R. This, by the way, is a proof that the P^s of chap. 4 is not identical with the P^s or R of chap. 3. It is taken up again so pedantically that even the expression *בְּאֵזְבֵּחַ* is applied to the tasks

of the Levites: their parts in the work of the sanctuary are then more precisely determined. The governing principles in this matter are, first, an effort to regulate the details as completely as possible; and, secondly, the tendency to distinguish between the service of the Levites and the priests with the utmost clearness and thoroughness. With reference to the latter point it need only be mentioned that the Kohathites, who, in chap. 3, have charge of the vessels of the sanctuary, are mere burden-bearers in chap. 4, not even allowed to pack up the vessels: the priests attend to this, and with such exclusiveness that they put the staves into the packed-up loads, whereas P^s attaches them directly to the vessels.' We need not traverse many pages for a further illustration of Holzinger's method. Here is a note on 4³: 'The period of service for the Levites, from their 30th to their 50th year, was lengthened by the M.T. of 8^{24f.} and (probably under its influence) by the LXX here, who extend it from the 25th year to the 50th. This extension within P^s shows that chap. 8 is later than chap. 4. The more recent laws correspond with the actual practice of later times: eventually, the 20th year became the starting-point, and no upper limit was fixed (1 Ch 23^{8, 24}, see Benzinger, *in loc.*). In contrast with the older custom of employing quite young people as helpers in the ritual (see Ex 24⁵) this late commencement of the time of service

is noteworthy. Perhaps it was thought desirable that the ministers should have attained a riper manhood (cp., *inter alia*, the rabbinical prohibition of the reading of the Song of Solomon till the age of 30.)' Holzinger's sarcasm on an attempt to harmonize chaps. 4 and 8 is caustic, but well deserved. The truth is, that it is quite useless for any one to endeavour to bring the ordinances of the Hexateuch into harmony: they represent a long course of development. And although the commentary now before us is not easy reading, we can promise anyone unfamiliar with the subject that if he will take pains to follow the arguments, and work out the references here given, he will have no difficulty in seeing for himself the strata out of which the laws are built up.

Reference was recently made in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES¹ to the full treatment of archæological questions in Dr. Buchanan Gray's recently published *Commentary on Numbers*. Holzinger's expositions are on the same lines. But the English book is much fuller. One notices also that Gray has the advantage in that he has availed himself of the very latest information, using, with good effect, the kindred laws of Hammurabi to illustrate the ordeal in case of jealousy (Nu 5).

JOHN TAYLOR.

¹ Vol. xiv. p. 481. See also the review in the October number.

Scripture Teaching in Girls' Schools.¹

BY HELENA L. POWELL, PRINCIPAL OF THE CAMBRIDGE TRAINING COLLEGE.

I AM here, as one who has had the experience of teaching Holy Scripture to girls, to give the result of that experience to others in the same position, to make any use they can of it. I speak as one who, in eighteen years of such work, has found increasing joy in it, and a deepening conviction of its value, but also an ever-growing consciousness of its difficulty, owing to the obvious fact that traditional views are no longer possible to the serious student.

¹ The following paper was read by Miss Powell, Principal of Cambridge Training College, formerly Headmistress of the Leeds High School for Girls, during the recent course of Biblical Study at Cambridge.

I.

For the teacher, this difficulty is all to the good: this need for the restatement of truth, for reconsideration of our position. For we teach better when we are off the ruts, when the mind is exercised to the utmost: everything is to be welcomed which wards off the danger of mechanical teaching, which makes us obliged to think, to read, to wrestle. We remember the student who came to Dr. Westcott with a difficulty on some theological point, and who, having listened to an explanation and thanked the great scholar, saying, 'It is quite clear now,' was met by the exclamation

of pious horror, 'I hope not.' In our desire for simplicity and definiteness and clearness in our teaching we may lose more precious things, and all the upheaval of old beliefs helps us, as teachers, if it induces us to suspend judgment, to realize that things are not true just because we want them to be true, which guards us against the danger of what Bacon calls 'too strict positions.'

But the main difficulty is that we, in our position, cannot be abreast of all the latest thought and discovery: it would need the devotion of all our time and intellect, and many other things are pressing on teachers in schools. Even in this exceptional opportunity for biblical study, how impossible most of us are finding it to keep up in reading and thought with the teaching we are having. In the press of school work it is so easy to give up altogether, and, because we cannot do much, to refuse to do the little that we can; it is only too easy to find excuses for not pursuing some special line of study. But the result will be dead teaching: very clear and definite, perhaps, but with no principle of life in it which will make it spring and grow in the minds of our pupils.

All of us can read a little, and we must read as much as we can. At least it will be enough to set us thinking: to guard us against cheap and easy judgments. It is of the utmost importance for our children that we should be as full of light as possible. But we dare not be guilty of the dishonesty of accepting results without going through the processes, therefore we shall be careful not to be as dogmatic in our assertion of new theories as the most reactionary teacher could be about traditional views, and we shall beware of accepting lightly every advanced speculation as necessarily true, remembering that it has often happened that the discovery of fresh evidence has re-established a tradition which experts pronounced to be incredible. We shall creep along carefully, 'accepting of nothing but approved and tried,' as Bacon says; and we shall teach as learners, saying often, 'Scholars tell us that this view is no longer to be held: I am not in a position to tell you yet what are the reasons.' We shall not hesitate to acknowledge what Hooker calls 'a religious ignorance' when we have done our utmost to purge our souls from the irreligious ignorance which is the result of sloth and cowardice.

II.

Many teachers who admit the duty of keeping their own reading as far as possible in touch with modern research, yet think it advisable to let their teaching, at least for the present distress, be in accordance with traditional views; they hesitate to 'unsettle' the minds of their pupils by opening up to them new views: 'Why break down old foundations when the new ones are scarcely laid?' they ask, 'Why not wait for a few generations till criticism has done its work and a positive constructive teaching has been developed?'

To this position I venture to think there are several grave objections.

And, first, are we above all things anxious that our pupils should be 'settled' in mind? I would very seriously urge that the settled state is not one of growth and development; that we should be content to face bravely for our pupils, as for ourselves, the discipline of unsolved problems, and should be on our guard against the desire to 'tidy up' the mind. It is the essence of bad teaching, in any subject, to clear away the difficulties and to pare off all the excrescences of a truth so as to present it in a symmetrical shape. 'A hundred difficulties don't make one doubt,' Newman used to say, and to allow difficulties to be presented to a young mind is not to shake its faith, but to make it robust and healthy—

Welcome each rebuff,
That turns earth's smoothness rough,
Each sting that bids nor sit nor stand but go.

And I would say to each teacher, What are you there for, but to meet these difficulties with your pupils and fight them through with them? The shock, if shock there must be, can be more safely met under the guidance of a trusted teacher; if our pupils find that we can face new views and strange aspects of truth without panic and without any loss of faith in the old truths themselves, they will gain courage and confidence.

And, on the other hand, we need beware of the terrible Nemesis that may follow on the withholding of truth from minds which are at the stage to receive it. It can only be for a little time that our pupils can be ignorant of the fact that traditional views are discredited or at least questioned, and when they find out that their teachers have either been ignorant of, or have suppressed, truth relating to the groundwork on which they

built their structure of religious teaching, they will be ready to reject the teaching itself, looking on it as all of a piece—old-fashioned, out of date. Most of us have heard of the intelligent boy in the Sunday school who found a difficulty in the story of Elisha making the iron swim, because it was contrary to gravitation, and being met by the pious and ignorant teacher with the cutting rejoinder, 'I don't know what gravitation is, and I don't want to know, as it must be a very wicked thing if it contradicts the Bible.' Suppose our attitude were the same with regard to the Babylonian legends of the Creation; if we either refused to consider them or concealed our knowledge from our older pupils, how could our lessons help them when in the after-time the strain of questioning and criticism came upon them—when their 'feet had almost gone,' their 'treadings had well-nigh slipt,' and they were tempted among the clamour of voices that deny, 'to say even as they'?

What more can we hope than that they should be held up by the remembrance of the teacher who did 'set to her seal that God is true,' even in the face of difficulty and perplexity?

And such an attitude betrays a want of trust in Truth—'Truth always and everywhere a sacred trust from God for the service of men,' to quote the words of Aubrey Moore, himself a fearless searcher after truth from all sources. No position can be more hopeless than that of those who are blindly fighting against the advance of what they call secular knowledge, forgetting that, as Dr. Rashdall reminds us, 'Religion is rational and reason is Divine, and all knowledge and all truth, from whatever source derived, must be capable of harmonious adjustment.' They will find themselves first holding one position and then beaten back to another, only able to keep off for a time the advance of the victorious opponent.

This zeal [says Lotze], while it injures science, gains no advantage for itself; for, since it cannot avert the coming results of investigation, it will at last find itself in the disagreeable position of having to regulate its faith according to the discoveries of the hour. It would escape this fate if it were more clearly conscious at the outset that the real treasures of faith are independent of any special form of the historical course of events.

So does the philosopher lay bare the weakness of the position of those who would suppress or resist truth in the supposed interests of those whom they are trying to guide in the search of truth.

For, lastly, what have we to fear from investigation, discovery, criticism? Is our case weak?

Are we secretly afraid that it will not bear the full light of truth upon it? It is, according to the old saying, courage which makes the theologian, 'pectus facit theologum'—a rational courage, based on the conviction of truth of revelation; whoever holds firmly to the fact of inspiration, without committing himself to the manner of it, need fear no inquiry into the origin of our sacred books—

*Si fractus illabatur orbis
Impavidum ferient ruinae.*

'He will not be afraid of any evil tidings, for his heart standeth fast and believeth on the Lord.'

There is a fine passage in Stirling's Gifford Lectures, which I will ask permission to quote, directed, I think, to all who are distressed and fearful that recent discoveries may alter our estimate of our own Scriptures—

For the sake of comparison let us consent, so far, and for this purpose, to place the sacred books of the Hebrews on the same level as the sacred books of the East, and what have we lost? Will they lose in the regard? Is it not amusing at times to note the exultation with which our great Cochinese and Anamese scholars, our great Tonquin explorers, will hold up some mere halting verse or two, or say some bill of sale, against the Hebrew Scriptures. Suppose the state of the case reversed. Suppose we had been rejoicing all this time in these bills of sale, and halting verses, nay, give them all, give them their own best, suppose we had been rejoicing all this time in the Confucian Kings and the very oldest Vedas, and suppose, in the face of all these possessions, the Hebrew Scriptures, unknown before, were suddenly dug up and brought to light. Then, surely, there might be a cry, and a simultaneous shout that never before had there been such a glorious—never before had there been such a miraculous—find! The sacred writings of the Hebrews, indeed, are so immeasurably superior to those of every other name that, for the sake of the latter, to invite a comparison is to undergo instantaneous extinction. Nay, regard these Scriptures as a literature only, the literature of the Jews—even then, in the kind of quality, is there any literature to be compared with it? Will it not even then remain still as the sacred literature? A taking simpleness, a simple takingness that is Divine—all that can lift us out of our own weekday selves and place us, pure then, holy, rapt, in the joy and the peace of Sabbath feeling and Sabbath vision, is to be found in the mere nature of these old idylls, in the full-filling sublimity of these Psalms, in the inspired Godwards of these intense-souled prophets.

The fear of offending parents is often brought forward as a reason against teaching as fully as one would wish. Personally I do not believe in the

parent difficulty. Most parents are only too ready to leave all the responsibility to the teacher, and those parents who really care for these things, know that if they send their children to us to be taught, they must trust us to do our best for them, and we shall not do our best by trying to give teaching which will offend nobody—which would be worthless teaching—but by teaching the truth as we see it. There is always the conscience clause for the parent who really thinks our teaching harmful, and we dare not hold back truth from the many for the sake of keeping the one.

III.

But criticism will not, in any case, be the main subject of our Scripture lessons, for it concerns only the form and the earthen vessel in which we have our treasures; the treasure itself which we have to set forth is God's revelation of Himself, which is the same whether it be given by means of literal fact or allegory, through history or legend; this is what we have to open up to our children in our Scripture lessons,—Divinity, not history, or geography, or antiquities. Whatever view be taken of the narrative of Creation in the beginning of Genesis, the essential teaching remains the same—the Divine authorship of the universe; so that we may seek for revelation of God in Nature—and, still more important, the Divine origin of man—so that we may know ourselves to be *capax deitatis*, capable of Divinity; that we come from God and go to God—that 'we are His offspring.'

Whether or not the story of the Fall be an allegory, the spiritual teaching stands out equally clearly—the nature of sin, as the rebellion of the will; the result of sin, as separation from God; the Divine purpose of redemption, 'God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself.'

'Ye search the Scriptures, and they are they which testify of Me.' Here is the Divine authority for the statement of the object of teaching Holy Scripture: it is because it is the witness to God, the revelation of His character and of His will, and, therefore, of man's duty and the ideal of human character. God's revelation of Himself in Scripture, studied in the light of His further revelation of Himself in the conscience, in the external world, in human experience; proving itself genuine by its harmony with that further revelation; showing itself to be inspired, as has been well said, not by its distance from, but by its nearness to,

the experience of life; this is what we have to uphold.

But—granted that the revelation of God and the consequent duty of man is what we have to teach, and seeing that God has revealed Himself fully in the face of Jesus Christ, and has set Him forth as the perfect human example—it might be urged that the teaching of the Gospel is enough, and the most direct and the shortest way of attaining our end. The answer to this is, that it is not according to sound educational principles to try to arrive at results without processes; that the wise teacher is distrustful of short ways, and does not seek for quick returns, and will not try to build except on a deeply laid foundation. The education of the individual must follow the line of that of the race, and the mind must be led to trace the gradual unfolding of God's revelation of Himself, so that it may be able to enter into the final consummation of it in the person of Christ. So we shall teach the Old Testament side by side with the New, reading each in the light of the other, knowing that '*Novum Testamentum in vetere latet: Vetus Testamentum in novo patet.*' We shall teach the Old Testament not as something apart, past and done away with, as if the old dispensation were a plan which had been tried and failed, and the New Testament a departure *de novo*; but we shall show how the revelation came 'by divers portions and in divers manners,' and was gradually evolved towards completion; that in the Divine economy each lesson in the knowledge of God is a preparation for the next. We shall show the imperfect morality of the Old Testament to be the result of this gradual revelation, the result of human limitation, and not the lowering of the Divine ideal. Just as in other subjects we try to make the lesson simple for beginners, by isolating our examples and simplifying the conditions,—as, for example, in a problem in physics we eliminate friction,—so we find in the simple conditions of the Old Testament characters, consequent on their very limitations, easier and more forcible illustration of the great elementary virtues. In the life of Abraham we can show clearly the essential character of faith, the great venture made possible by a realization of the unseen; from the story of Jacob and Esau we can show the greater possibilities of the character which, with so many less attractive qualities, has the higher grasp, the spiritual ambition, and so wins a higher blessing than that of the 'profane

person' who will subordinate higher considerations to the satisfaction of mere bodily wants; and we shall show how it is always so; that this is the working of a Divine law, that the easy-going, sensual person does not achieve high things.

These character-studies in the Old Testament, with the light thrown on them from the New, are of the greatest help in training the characters of our pupils. For the best girls rightly have a wholesome horror of having their souls dragged out into the light, but they can, without any shock to this natural reserve, see their own faults and weaknesses expressed in the character of others. The child who is inclined to be satisfied with religious emotion and observance, instead of dutifulness in daily life, can learn from Saul's example that 'to obey is better than sacrifice,' and the girl who, in the excitement of a school friendship, is apt to sit loose to family ties, may learn the right proportion from Jonathan, who, 'loving David as his own soul,' stayed with his father to the end, and when justly moved to fierce anger at that father's injustice to his friend, went out rather than let unfilial words escape him.

If it is urged that these studies of character can be got from other classics, I reply—setting aside for a moment the important consideration that the teaching of the Bible has a strength which no other has, because we rightly come to it with the prepossession of its being God's most authoritative revelation of Himself—that in none is the ethical tone so high, nowhere else is religion so pure. Take, for example, the comparison between the character of Jacob and that of Ulysses. We hear much of the imperfect morality of the Old Testament, but the record of imperfect morality need not be, and is not in this case, imperfect moral teaching. Jacob is a deceiver, but the whole tone of the narrative goes against any approval of his deception, and we see him thwarted and deceived all his life afterwards, his sin working out its own punishment. Compare with this the picture of Ulysses as drawn in the *Odyssey*, where we are clearly meant to admire his subtlety, and it is through this that he succeeds. Or, take another parallel, we have the wonderful lesson of Abraham's sacrifice of Isaac. 'God told Abraham'—that is, surely, Abraham's conscience, his highest sense of right, told him—that he ought to be ready to give up his most precious possession to God, and that conviction he proceeded to put into

action in the way in which the nations from whom he had come out expressed that God-given instinct of the human heart. But, as he is in the very act, he attains a higher knowledge of God's Will. 'If any man will do His Will he shall know of the doctrine,' and he realizes that human sacrifice cannot be pleasing to God. Compare with this the sacrifice of Iphigenia by Agamemnon. He gives her up partly out of religious conviction, partly out of public spirit, and partly under the pressure of public opinion. The gods interfere to prevent the sacrifice, but only by spiriting Iphigenia away. There is nothing to teach Agamemnon that such an act is not pleasing to the Deity.

IV.

The more one teaches the Old Testament, the more one sees that the moral teaching is the highest possible under the circumstances—that God in His gradual training of His people bore with defects of qualities until the qualities themselves were fully grounded. Thus Israel must be intolerant, narrow with regard to other nations, until Israel is quite purged from any inclination to idolatry, and I, for one, do not hesitate to teach all the fierce wars against the Canaanites, hoping that my children will learn from them the important lesson, needed now as much as then, 'Ye that love the Lord, see that ye hate the thing that is evil.' The Canaanites did stand for the enemies of Jehovah; and it was not the mercy, but the indifference, of the Israelites which spared them. While keeping in mind the higher teaching of the gospel revelation, we may get for our children the full value of the elementary lessons.

When we come to the historical part of the Bible, illustrated from Psalms and prophets, our lessons become of increasing value for the older girls. Social questions press upon us, and the future in regard to them depends upon a right attitude of mind towards them in the rising generation; and I can think of no way of securing this so effective as the witness of the prophets to the God 'who will be a swift witness against him that oppreseth the hireling in his wages,' and the message of deep anger against those 'who sold the righteous for silver and the poor for a pair of shoes.'

'Can you make lessons on the prophets interesting?' someone asked last week. Our task is not

to make the prophets interesting to our pupils, but to make the pupils interested in the prophets.

'When I find a man who doesn't think history interesting, I don't try to alter history, I try to alter him,' Professor Seeley once said, and surely if we can get at all into touch with our pupils, it will not be difficult to awake in them a sense of the intense reality of the prophet's message for here and now.

You will remember how Archbishop Temple, in his essay in *Essays and Reviews* on the education of the world, drew out the three different stages that must succeed each other in the education of the race and of the individual—(1) Law, (2) Example, (3) Spirit.

The Old Testament shows us the education through law, spiritualized indeed by the teaching of the prophets, but always a question of demand and fulfilment.

The gospel gives us the training of example, and our lessons will be directed to helping our children to see the living picture of the Christ in His acts and words, to give them what Newman called 'a real rather than a notional apprehension' of it. Remembering that the Revelation is a Person, and that He appeals to every part of man, feelings and will, as well as to intellect, we shall first try to present a view of the Person of Christ, building up, mainly from the Synoptic Gospels, but taking in also the narrative parts of St. John, a connected life of our Lord. We shall use all our powers to present to the imagination of our children a living picture of the Christ who moved along the shores of the Lake of Galilee, and through the Temple courts, and in the home at Bethany, watching the children playing and observing the sparrows fall, and rejoicing in the beauty of the lilies, relieving pain and distress, speaking words of encouragement to the timid and broken, and of sternness to the pretentious and arrogant,—such a picture as shall reach the affections and move the will, before we attempt much strain upon the intellect. We shall teach the facts before the interpretation, knowing that the Person must be known and loved before He can be understood. And in doing this we shall be following what seems to have been the order in which the revelation was made to the apostles. It was only after three years of discipleship that they were met by the great question, 'Whom say ye that I am?'

As the children get older, we shall set before them the different aspects in which the Life was viewed by the different evangelists. To show how His miracles were not mere wonders, but signs of His character,—*works* as St. John calls them,—the outcome of His nature, to trace His training of His apostles and His gradual revelation of Himself to them 'as they were able to bear it,' to show how character is exposed in the light of His presence, is to bring them by a moral conviction to exclaim with the centurion, 'Truly this was the Son of God.'

Then, again, with still older girls, we shall pass to the third stage of the education, and shall show by the Acts and Epistles how the early Church was guided by the Holy Spirit into the fuller knowledge of these truths—how the meaning of Christ's life and teaching unfolded itself to them as the Spirit brought all things to their remembrance, and the great intellectual gifts of St. Paul were pressed into the service, to spread among the Gentiles the knowledge of the 'Desire of all Nations.' We shall try at this stage to give our pupils some understanding of the preparation in history for Christ—how the spread of the Roman Empire had brought all parts of the world together; how it had broken down the national barriers, accustoming men to think of one rule, and so made possible the conception of one God; how the widespread Greek tongue supplied a common vehicle of expression and a most perfect language for conveying religious truths, and how the settlements of Jews in all parts of the world made centres of illumination from which the pagan world could receive the light, and how all those causes converged to a single point 'when the fulness of the time was come.'

We shall try, too, to show them the *moral* preparation for Christ—'How the world had done its best that it might despair of its best'; how ancient religions were discredited and philosophy powerless, and how

On that hard pagan world disgust
And utter loathing fell,
Deep weariness and sated lust
Made human life a hell.

As to the question of text-books, there are many good books about the Bible: Aglen's *Old Testament History* is one of the best, and the 'Cambridge Companion to the Bible' is invaluable, but the danger of their being used as substitutes for

the Bible is so great that I think it is best to put none of them into the hands of young pupils. Close acquaintance with the text, such as was more common in past generations than in this—whole chapters learnt by heart, bring a power of interpretation which often gives to quite simple-minded and uneducated people a wonderful understanding of the meaning of very difficult passages. The mind soaked in the very words of Scripture creates for itself an atmosphere which is favourable for the apprehension of it; long pondering over words draws out the hidden meaning; it is as when you read over and over a bit of 'unseen' translation till it gradually shapes itself into sense. No child should leave school without having learnt by heart many Psalms, Proverbs 3, Job 28, Isaiah 53, the Beatitudes (or the whole Sermon on the Mount), the great parables, and St. John 14, 15, 16, and as much more as can be managed.

I know that many teachers fear that the Bible, with its very outspoken language, may bring children too soon to a knowledge of things which should only come with riper years. I think that when children are too young to understand, they do not notice these sayings—there is nothing in

their minds to which they can catch on; and when they are older, and have to learn something of the mysteries of the beginning of life, there is no way by which the knowledge can come so wholesomely as by the simple, straight, pure words of Holy Scripture, familiar to them since their childhood, gradually coming to have a meaning for them.

As to passages which one would never wish them to read, they will not come across them unless they search for them, and any child who has so much evil curiosity as to wish to do that, is an abnormal case and would need special treatment, and would certainly get hold of a Bible for wrong use, even if it were not put into her hands for instruction. I am sure that such cases are rare, and need not count for our general principle of dealing with children. I have an unshaken conviction that the Scriptures are able to make our children 'wise unto salvation through the faith which is in Christ Jesus.' Through faith—'Credo ut intellegam'—I believe that I may know; and it is because I believe that I would lead a child fearlessly in pursuit of truth—from whatever source derived—sure that it can only lead us to Him who is the Truth.

St. Luke's Passion-Narrative considered with Reference to the Synoptic Problem.

By THE REV. CANON SIR JOHN C. HAWKINS, BART., M.A., OXFORD.

IF the principle that the Second Gospel is older than the First and Third, and is used in them as a *Grundschrift* and framework, to which introductions, insertions, and conclusions are added by the respective compilers, is ever dislodged from its present position of general acceptance among students of the Synoptic Problem, it will be because its advocates state it too broadly, and without due exceptions and qualifications. It is therefore very important that these should be distinctly recognized and acknowledged. The chief *exceptions* are St. Luke's two 'interpolations' (6²⁰⁻⁸³ and 9⁵¹⁻¹⁸¹⁴), as to which I have been allowed to point out in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES (xiv. 18 ff., 90 ff., 137 ff.) that the Marcan source seems to have been entirely disused in them; and his 'great omission' (after Lk 9¹⁷) of all

the matter contained in Mk 6⁴⁵⁻⁸²⁶ may be regarded as an exception of another kind. The chief *qualification* of the principle, as distinguished from actual exceptions to it, is that exhibited in Mt 8-13, where the order of the Marcan narrative is but little regarded, though nearly the whole of its substance is preserved (see THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, xii. 471 ff., xiii. 20 ff.; also Mr. Allen's 'Critical Study' in xi. 279 ff.). I wish now to conclude this series of articles by pointing out that another qualification, though of a less conspicuous kind, is to be found in Lk 22¹⁴⁻²⁴¹⁰, which may be described with sufficient accuracy for our present purpose as St. Luke's Passion-narrative, though it commences with the institution of the Lord's Supper, and includes the visit of the women to the empty

tomb. There the Marcan source is not indeed deserted, as it apparently is in the three divisions of Luke above referred to; nor is its main order departed from, as in Mt 8-13, but that source is used with a freedom, as to details both of matter and of order, to which there is no parallel elsewhere in any considerable department of the two Gospels that are founded upon it.

I propose to give proofs of this statement, and then to suggest a certain significance that it seems to have as bearing upon the authorship and composition of the Third Gospel.

That these 123 verses of Passion-narrative are rightly reckoned among those portions of Luke, forming 469 verses out of 1149, or about two-fifths of the Gospel, which are to be regarded as in some sense founded upon the Marcan basis, will be generally admitted. The proof of this lies not only or chiefly in the main sequence of events, which indeed could not be very different in the Passion-narratives, and which is to a large extent paralleled in the Fourth Gospel also, but also and most forcibly in the smaller structural and verbal similarities to Mark (who is here closely followed throughout by Matthew) which appear in such verses as Lk 22^{18, 22, 42, 46, 47, 52f, 54b, 61, 71} 23^{22, 26, 34b, 44f, 46, 52f, 24^{6a}}.

Our attention therefore may be mainly directed to the other task of showing the unusual and remarkable freedom with which Luke here uses his fundamental source. This may be best exhibited by way of contrast (I.) with Matthew's procedure in his parallel Passion-narrative, and (II.) with Luke's own procedure in the other parts of his Gospel which rest upon the same basis.

I.

i. The degrees of closeness with which Mark's wording is followed in any parts of the First and Third Gospels respectively may be ascertained with a very near approach to accuracy by a method which Mr. Rushbrooke's invaluable *Synopticon* makes practicable. There it may be seen how many of the words used in any passage of any one Gospel are reproduced, wholly or in part, in the corresponding passage of any other Gospel. Thus, to take one short verse as an illustration, in Lk 22⁴², which contains 19 words, 12 words are either wholly or in part printed in red or in spaced type, thus showing that those 12 words are, either in their entirety as *παρένευχε* and the 5 following words,

or in part as the *θελ* in *θέλημα*, found also in Mk 14³⁶. Now if we examine in that way both the 123 verses of Luke's Passion-narrative and also the 130 verses of Matthew's parallel narrative, which extend from 26²⁰ to 28⁶, and if we tabulate and compare the results of those examinations, so as to show the amount of agreement with Mark's wording which those narratives respectively show, a very striking contrast presents itself. Matthew's narrative contains 2083 words; and of these we find that 1070 words, being about 51 per cent., or a trifle more than half, agree either wholly or in part with the words used in Mark. Luke's narrative contains 1906 words; but of these only 507 words, being not much more than a quarter, or about 27 per cent., are found either wholly or partially in Mark. That is to say, *Matthew adheres to Mark's language very nearly twice as closely as Luke does*—surely a very notable and significant contrast, as implying very different ways of dealing with the same source. And to those who hold—as it seems to me impossible to avoid holding—that both oral and documentary transmission had shares in the formation of the First and Third Gospels, the natural inference will be that in this part of Matthew the documentary mode of transmission, and in this part of Luke the oral mode, very largely preponderated.

ii. The same inference may be drawn, though less definitely and less directly, if we compare the two Passion-narratives in a less mechanical way, paying attention, not to the amount of verbal alteration from Mark shown in them, but to the amount of distinctly new matter which they respectively add to that source, thus supplying us with additional information. No doubt opinions will differ to a certain extent as to what should thus be classed as distinctly new matter, but I think that in Matthew we may thus label 25 complete verses and 2 half verses, viz. 26^{25, 50a, 52-54, 27^{3-10, 19, 24f, 43, 51b, 52f, 62-66, 28^{2, 4}}}, besides a few brief phrases, of which *εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν* (26²⁸) is perhaps the most important. In Luke, on the other hand, the new information given us (excluding 22²⁴⁻²⁷ as being probably transferred from Mk 9^{34f} and 10⁴²⁻⁴⁵) may be fairly estimated as filling 33 verses and 3 half verses, viz. 22^{28f, 30} (cf., however, Mt 19²⁸) 31f, 35-38, 48f, 51, 61a, 67b, 68 23^{2, 5-12, 15, 27-31, 40-43, 46b, 48}, besides some briefer additions, such as *ὡς ἐγένετο ἡμέρα* (22⁶⁶). There are also 3 such verses and 2 half verses which have not

been reckoned here, being those which are double-bracketed by W.H. as probably insertions by a later hand than Luke's (22^{19b, 20, 43f.} 23^{34a}). And it has not been thought necessary to complicate the comparison by referring to additions to Mark which are identical in Matthew and Luke, for these, so far as they have any importance at all, are limited to two, viz. *τίς ἐστιν ὁ παῖσας σε* in Mt 26⁶⁸, Lk 22⁶⁴, and *ἐξελθὼν ἕξω . . . πικρῶς* in Mt 26⁷⁵, Lk 22⁶²; cf. also Mt 27⁵⁴ with Lk 23⁴⁷. It may be remarked in passing that the extreme fewness and slightheadness of these correspondences seems to show that the (? Logian) source upon which Matthew and Luke had previously drawn so largely did not extend over the period of the Passion.

We have seen, then, that the new or non-Marcian information given in Luke's Passion-narrative only exceeds in amount that given in Matthew's to a comparatively small extent, the proportion between the two being only about four to three (34½ verses against 26, according to the above approximate estimates). That small excess would in itself be hardly worth our notice. But it is certainly important to observe that the difference between the two narratives *as to the way in which the new matter is introduced*, is very much more marked—so much so that in *Synopticon*, while two of its large pages (195 f.), suffice for exhibiting Matthew's 'single tradition,' fully five of them (from the middle of p. 227 to the middle of p. 232) are required for Luke's 'single tradition.' The cause of this notable difference is that Matthew's additions are, in nearly every case, simply insertions into the Marcan text—insertions generally made without involving any alterations in that text, though occasionally causing slight modifications of a few words at the points where the older narrative is resumed, as in 26⁵⁵ 27^{11, 26}. So it will be found—except only in 28²⁻⁴, where the matter is complicated by the previous notice of the setting of the watch—that if one strikes out with a pen the Matthaean insertions, it will need only a few more strokes of that pen in order to remove the few resumptive words, and thus to make the narrative as consecutive and as intelligible as in the original Marcan text. But the case is very different when we turn to Luke's additions, for we find that the Marcan narrative is in many cases very considerably modified for the sake of them. To work out this point in detail, would require more space than

can be given here; but striking instances may be seen in the setting and environment of Lk 22^{31f.} 67f. 23^{5-12, 40-43}. The old and the new matter are so blended that the one is often unintelligible without the other. And therefore it was, for the sake of intelligibility, that it was found necessary to print in *Synopticon* so many Lucan verses which are substantially parallel to Mark, besides those which are simply Lucan additions; and thus, as has been already said, while the proportion of actually new Lucan matter to actually new Matthaean matter is only about four to three, the amount of space required to display them respectively is in the proportion of five to two.

Here again, then, we find in Luke a freedom of adaptation which points to just such modifications and expansions of the Marcan source as would occur in the course of continued oral use of it, while Matthew's procedure is that of a man who adhered as closely as he could—or at anyrate very closely—to his Marcan MS., even when he had to make insertions into it.

iii. A third distinction which may be observed between the habits of the two compilers points still more decidedly in the same direction. Transpositions or inversions, both verbal and substantial, of Mark's order, are unusually and remarkably frequent in Luke's Passion-narrative. The number of them is no less than 12. With the exceptions of Nos. 1 and 2 in the list, perhaps none of them have any practical importance in the way of giving us different impressions as to the course of events. The others are unimportant in themselves, being chiefly such transpositions of statements as do not necessarily imply any transposition of the facts referred to; but does not their very unimportance make it unlikely that a compiler using a MS. source would have taken the trouble to make such alterations from its order?

The list of the transpositions is as follows (it will be seen that Matthew always follows Mark, except in No. 11, where he does not supply a parallel):—

1. In Lk 22¹⁵⁻²³ the reference to the coming betrayal is recorded *after*, in Mt 14¹⁸⁻²⁵ (so Mt 26²¹⁻²⁹) it is recorded *before*, the institution of the Lord's Supper. This difference is highly important and interesting in its bearing on the question whether Judas was one of those who received the eucharistic bread and wine.

2. (a) If the short Western text preferred by

W.H. is adopted in Lk 22¹⁷⁻²⁰, the only cup mentioned is given *before* the bread at the Last Supper (cf. 1 Cor 10¹⁶ and *Didache* 9), and not *after* it, as in Mk 14²²⁻²⁴ (so Mt 26²⁶⁻²⁸).

(b) If the usual and longer text is there followed, there is a transposition of another kind connected with the institution of the Lord's Supper; for the saying, 'I will not drink from henceforth,' etc., in Lk 22¹⁸⁻²⁰ *precedes*, while in Mk 14²²⁻²⁵ (so Mt 26²⁶⁻²⁹) it *follows*, the words of institution.

It is true that both these transpositions are avoided by the arrangement of the narrative in b and e, and very similarly in Syr^{our} and Syr^{sin}; but almost certainly such arrangement was not original, but made for harmonistic purposes.

3. In Lk 22²¹⁻²³ the intimation that the traitor would be one who was then present at the table, and the woe pronounced upon him, *precede*, in Mk 14¹⁹⁻²¹ (so Mt 26²²⁻²⁴) they *follow*, the questioning of the apostles as to which of them should be the traitor. It is possible, however, that the questioning among themselves in Luke is to be regarded as an incident distinct from the question 'Is it I?' addressed by them to Jesus in Mark and Matthew.

4. In Lk 22^{33f.} Peter's denial is foretold *before*, in Mk 14²⁹⁻³² (so Mt 26³³⁻³⁵) *after*, the departure from the supper room.

5. In Lk 22⁵⁶⁻⁷¹ Peter's denials are recorded *before* the examination before the high priest and the mockery by the soldiers there, but in Mk 14⁵⁵⁻⁷² (so Mt 26⁵⁹⁻⁷⁵) *after* those incidents. Here, however, Luke's reason for making the transposition is obvious; it was in order to bring together in his vv. 55 and 56 the statements which Mark separates in his vv. 54 and 66.

6. And in Lk 22⁶³⁻⁷¹ the mockery is related *before*, but in Mk 14⁵⁵⁻⁶⁵ (so Mt 26⁵⁹⁻⁶⁸) *after*, the examination.

Thus the joint result of the transpositions numbered 6 and 7 is that the three incidents are recorded in these different orders (note yet another arrangement in Jn 18¹²⁻²⁷):—

LUKE.	MARK (and MATTHEW).
1. Denials.	1. Examination.
2. Mockery.	2. Mockery.
3. Examination.	3. Denials.

7. In Lk 23³⁵⁻³⁸ the superscription on the cross is not mentioned until *after* the reviling and mockery by the rulers and soldiers, though before that by the one malefactor; but in Mk 15²⁶⁻³² (so

Mt 27³⁷⁻⁴⁴) the mention of the superscription *precedes* the mockery of passers-by and chief priests and soldiers, as well as the reproaches of the two malefactors.

8. In Lk 23³⁶, as has just been said, mockery is ascribed to the soldiers in connexion with offering the vinegar (a connexion perhaps suggested by Ps 69^{21f.}) when Jesus is on the cross; but mockery from soldiers is only mentioned by Mark at a much earlier stage, viz. in chap. 15¹⁶⁻²⁰ (so Mt 27²⁷⁻³¹) referring to the Prætorium. Luke also speaks of Herod's soldiers as mocking (23¹¹). Of course it is possible that three distinct incidents, or at least two, may be referred to; but some amount of transposition seems far more probable, judging from the analogy of other cases in which such transferences of words undoubtedly took place.

9. In Lk 23^{45f.} the rending of the veil is recorded *before*, in Mk 15^{37f.} (so Mt 27^{50f.}) *after*, the death of Jesus.

10. The time of the deposition and burial, viz. the evening of the day of preparation, is only mentioned by Luke (23⁵⁰⁻⁵⁴) *after* his account of the request of Joseph and the entombment, but it is named *before* those incidents in Mk 15⁴²⁻⁴⁶ (so *ὁψίας* in Mt 27⁵⁷). In Luke the notice of time seems also to have reference to the following statement about the women.

11. In Lk 23⁵⁶ the preparing of spices and ointments is mentioned *before* the Sabbath is named, and, if we had no other information, we should have supposed that this work was done on the eve of the day of rest; in Mk 16¹ the spices are said to have been bought when the Sabbath was *past*. Matthew has no mention of spices or ointments.

12. Luke, in 24¹⁻¹⁰, does not give the names of the women until *after* he has described their visit to the tomb; Mark, in 16¹⁻⁸ (so Mt 28¹⁻⁸), *commences* his account by naming them.

Thus Luke exhibits twelve transpositions from Mark, where Matthew exhibits none. Now such inversions of order are very much more likely to occur in oral than in documentary transmission. The experience of those who have had personal experience of both these methods of reproduction of sources, on the one hand as extempore preachers or teachers, and on the other hand as authors, or even as copyists of extracts into their own notebooks, will have shown them that writers are very

unlikely to make changes in the order of the materials before them, except for some special purpose, but that such inversions are constantly occurring in the course of *memoriter* narration and instruction. (See Wright, *New Testament Problems*, pp. 91, 136 f.; also the present writer's *Horæ Synopticæ*, p. 62 f.)

We have seen, then, in three distinct ways, the remarkable freedom with which Luke, as contrasted with Matthew, uses in his Passion-narrative the Marcan *Grundschrift*. And in each case the freedom appeared to be of such a kind as was likely to result from oral use of the source.

(To be continued.)

At the Literary Table.

A HANDBOOK OF CHURCH HISTORY.

Religious Tract Society. 6s. net.

MANY have taken in hand to write short histories of the Church, but few have attained to any success therein. So the man must be desperate for work to do, or else possessed of overmastering desire to do this work, who once more attempts to comprehend the History of the Church in a single volume. Dr. Samuel G. Green has never been in straits for want of occupation. He felt that the History of the Church to the Reformation had to be written by him.

What has he made of it? His first aim seems to have been to be fair. There are two ways of taking a man or a movement. One is to discover the meanness of the man's motives, to see nothing but mischief in the movement. The other way is Dr. Green's. To use words of Canon Henson's this month in speaking of another historian, he has 'something like an intuitive perception of the higher elements in every man, and seeks to divine and utter their often half-understood and clumsily expressed ideals.' Much depends upon the sources an historian uses. However good his personal intention, he cannot be fair if he does not seek the truth on every side. Dr. Green's history is a people's history, and he does not parade his scholarship, but there is no doubt that he has used good authorities and without respect of person or of party.

The other feature of the book to note is this. It is a modern book. The history of the Church is not written in the language of mediævalism, but in modern language; the judgments it expresses are the author's own judgments. For the old way of writing history, by ill-disguised quotation and ill-digested opinion, is obsolete. What is called

the historical imagination, the true historian's first great gift, enables the modern writer to see as the ancients saw, and yet be modern still. And so the History of the Church is a development, the present and the past have no lost links between them, and God is never absent.

This is Dr. Green's best work. He may never do better work than this.

A SHORT HISTORY OF ANCIENT PEOPLES.

Hodder & Stoughton. 12s.

It is something to comprehend a History of the Church in one volume; it is something more to comprehend a History of the Ancient World. Dr. Samuel Green essayed and accomplished the former task. The latter has been attempted by Robinson Souttar, M.A., D.C.L. Has he accomplished it?

For the scholar he has not, but for the general reader he has. His statements are too confident for the scholar; the general reader will have confident statements or none at all. The scholar expects qualifications, authorities, what not; the general reader casts the book aside that contains them. The third chapter on Babylonia opens with 'Khammurabi (the Amraphel of the Old Testament)'—and the scholar is arrested. What proof have you for that parenthesis? Dr. Souttar does not write for the scholar. He writes for the general reader. And if that parenthesis is not proved, it is at least picturesque and possible. The scholar reads the list of authorities prefixed to the history of the Hebrews—The Bible; Josephus and Milman; five volumes by Professor Sayce, one by Professor Hommel, and one by Colonel Conder—and he is aghast. The general

reader knows these names better than any other, and is well content.

The 'Ancient Peoples' are: Egypt, Babylonia, Assyria, the Medes and Persians, the Hebrews, Phœnicia, Carthage, Greece, and Rome. The test is Israel. Dr. Robinson Souttar simply ignores all that Wellhausen and his followers have said. He rewrites the History of Israel as Milman rewrote it. We could have accepted more boldness. We should have welcomed some statement of the things that have been shaken since Milman wrote, some statement of the things that remain. But it was necessary to pass by or to accept. Dr. Souttar's way of ignoring the Higher Criticism is better for the general reader than the way of attacking it.

Greece is well done. It comes too soon, no doubt. If Dr. Souttar could have read Professor Ramsay's article in the forthcoming Extra Volume of the *Dictionary of the Bible*, he would have made still more of that part of his work. But every book is written too soon. There would be no books written at all if every one waited till every one else had published. Greece is well done, with a favour for the Athenians, which will delight the general reader.

ROUSSEAU.

T. & T. Clark. 3s. net.

As the 'World's Epoch-Makers' appear they steadily deepen the impression that the series is much more than an ordinary series of light biography. They will, with one or two exceptions perhaps, remain with us as the first effort to write History after a new and vastly improved method. There have always been a few who have distinguished History from Annals, the epoch-making from the ordinary man or movement. This series enables us all to skip whatever is insignificant, and see at once what in the history of the world has been momentous.

Professor W. H. Hudson, who writes the volume on Rousseau, recognizes that he has much more to do than epitomize the facts of Rousseau's life. His very title-page tells us that he has also had to describe 'Naturalism in Life and Thought.' Rousseau was a wonder in his day, and he is a wonder still. As Sir Henry Maine said: 'We have never seen in our generation—indeed, the world has not seen more than once or twice in

all the course of history—a literature which has exercised such prodigious influence over the minds of men as that which emanated from Rousseau between 1749 and 1762.' And yet, as Professor Hudson acknowledges, there was nothing in Rousseau to account for it. Genius he had, but he had nothing else. 'He was not a systematic thinker; his treatment of life was narrow and one-sided; his philosophy was full of paradoxes and inconsistencies; his teachings seem, from the point of view of the present day, a strange compound of the fantastic and the commonplace, the impossible and the obvious. In the whole body of his voluminous work there is nothing which for a moment we should be justified in ranking among those abiding things of literature which are independent of all fluctuations of theory and taste.' What is the secret of his influence? It is his environment. He came at a certain time, into certain tendencies of his time, and he fitted into these tendencies perfectly. He was, as Amiel said, 'an ancestor in all things.'

Thus Professor Hudson closes his story of the life and influence of Rousseau. He has made his book more than a biography, he has made it an introduction to the study of a strange and fascinating period in the history of the mind of man.

THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS.

Macmillan. 12s.

After long and scandalous neglect the Epistle to the Ephesians is to come to its own among us. Two commentaries are to be published within a month, and Messrs. Macmillan are to publish them both. The one is by the late Bishop Westcott. It will appear immediately. The other is by the present Dean of Westminster. It is in our hands.

Dr. Armitage Robinson's volume has been got up to range in size and colour and all externals with Lightfoot. But Dr. Armitage Robinson has departed somewhat from Lightfoot's way. The Greek text is here and notes on it, just as Lightfoot would have given it to us. But the introduction covers only 17 pages, there are no essays at the end; and, in the place of all that, there is a translation and exposition of the Epistle, standing by itself and occupying the first 150 pages.

What are the books that have preceded Armitage Robinson's? He names only the essay and few

notes of Lightfoot, the one in *Biblical Essays*, the other in *Notes on Epistles of St. Paul*; Hort's *Prolegomena to Romans and Ephesians*; and T. K. Abbott's edition in 'The International Critical Commentary.' Of the last he says: 'In order to retain some measure of independence I have refrained from consulting the English expositors of the Epistle, but I have constantly availed myself of Dr. T. K. Abbott's work in "The International Critical Commentary," since it is, as he says, primarily philological.'

What is the Dean of Westminster's position regarding the authorship and destination of this Epistle? It is Hort's. He says he has nothing to add to Dr. Hort's discussion of these matters, and he has not. What is his position exegetically? It is Lightfoot's. But not so entirely this time. Dr. Robinson differs occasionally from Lightfoot on the meaning of a phrase, and then he gives ample reasons for it. So some of the best things in the book, the detached notes on words and phrases, are due to this feeling that when he differs from Lightfoot he must give sufficient reason.

No doubt we shall find Westcott worth reading, but we cannot find much wanting, or wanting improvement, in Armitage Robinson. Nicety of scholarship and soundness of judgment are found together in his *Ephesians*, each in its perfection.

PRINCIPIA ETHICA.

Cambridge University Press. 7s. 6d. net.

The natural man has no idea that the science of right living is so incomprehensible. It is well for him that he does not know. What it is that makes a man cease to do evil and learn to do well, depends upon God and the man. It does not depend upon his study of the science of Ethics. And herein lies the wonder and the condemnation of it. All these generations, from Aristotle until now, it has been of first importance that men should cease to do evil and learn to do well, and yet the professors of that science are as far as ever from agreeing as to what is good and what is evil.

Mr. George Edward Moore, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, thinks it is time they did know. He has written his *Principia Ethica* to that end. The hindrance has chiefly been, he believes, in the abuse of language. Men will not use words in the same sense. One man contra-

dicts another while in entire agreement with him, not for the pleasure of contradicting, but because he is using the same words with a different meaning. Using the same words the two men are thinking about different things. First of all, says Mr. Moore, understand what you are speaking about.

So his *Principia Ethica* is meant to lay the foundation of the science of Ethics. 'I have endeavoured,' he says, 'to write Prolegomena to any future Ethics that can possibly pretend to be scientific.' He is not an evangelist. He does not carry round the message, 'Cease to do evil; learn to do well.' He is more primitive, more fundamental, than that. He does not even consider what is evil and what is well (though he touches that at the end). He examines the laws and ways for discovering that. Let us get our tools right, he says. We shall soon know the good (whether we do it or not is another matter) when we know the rules by which the good is separated in the mind from the bad. His book is delightfully lucid. There is a fine intellectual discipline in it, and yet it is as pleasant as a game of whist.

The Books of the Month.

THE INDIVIDUAL.

There is a study of the American Commonwealth that seeks to rival Dr. Bryce's great work. It is the joint effort of many writers. The editor is Dr. Nathaniel Shaler, Professor of Geology in Harvard University. Professor Shaler is also the author of a work lately published on *The Individual* (Appletons).

The new book is not a discussion of the philosophical problem of individuality. It is not at all philosophical, it is strictly and solely scientific. Dr. Shaler takes account of the fact that evolution has displaced creation: Man is what he is, not because he is made in the image of God, but because he has had innumerable ancestors. If he fears to die it will no longer be because 'first cometh death and after that the judgment'; partly it will be because the fear of death is one of the ways by which his ancestors, as far back as you can go, were led to take some care of their life; but mainly it will be because he will live so altru-

istically in the future that his death will be a serious loss to society.

So it is a study of life and death. Professor Shaler is not irreligious. But he is here scientific only. He touches the religious motive only in so far as it is one of the phenomena that come under his observation. It may be that a man will still be found here and there, after evolution has wholly displaced creation in ordinary minds, a man here and there and yet more often a woman, whose fearlessness of death is due to the death of Christ, but Dr. Shaler has nothing to do with that. In the great future, when evolution is triumphant, the sting of death will not be sin but goodness.

FRATRIBUS.

There are public schoolmasters who have to 'take duty' at the school chapel, and even think that they have afterwards to publish the sermons they preached. Mr. John Trant Bramston, M.A., has always counted the Sunday sermon his greatest privilege and his best opportunity. He is never dull. He is never condescending. He is never merely clever. If it is the master's duty to make Virgil and Plato profitable to the pupil, how much more, says Mr. Bramston, is it his duty to make Isaiah and Paul profitable, both for this life and also for that which is to come. We count him one of the elect few who can preach to boys, who can because they will. His publisher is Mr. Edward Arnold (5s. net).

DR. JOHN BROWN.

We are hard to please about John Brown. He is already one of our inner circle. We have accepted him among our dearest, and let our love go out to him. And we know him. Yet we will have people write and tell us more about him—and when they do, we are disappointed. No one could have written more loyally of Dr. John Brown than the late Dr. John Taylor Brown (A. & C. Black; 5s. net), but because he has not made the loved more lovable, or told us more about him, when we knew it all already, we are disappointed. Let us be reasonable. To know more is not necessary. It is enough to be in his company again while we read this book. And in his company we are. We may miss his own familiar way of writing. The pen may here come in between us a little, which never was so with himself. But we are in his company and among his friends, and it is very pleasant.

SAINT PAUL AND THE ANTE-NICENE CHURCH.

The Rev. Stewart Means, A.M., B.D., Rector of St. John's Church, New Haven, Conn., whom we first met as translator of Harnack's article in *Herzog* on the Apostles' Creed, has found time in the hurry of a busy city charge to write an 'Unwritten Chapter of Church History,' to which he has given the title of *Saint Paul and the Ante-Nicene Church* (A. & C. Black; 6s.). He faces one of the most prominent and, at the same time, most perplexing problems in Church History—the difference between the Christianity of St. Paul and the Christianity of the early Fathers—and he endeavours to explain the reasons of that difference. Can we gather his reasons into a sentence?—St. Paul was steeped in Rabbinism, the early Fathers knew most of Hellenism. Mr. Means makes much of St. Paul's early training: the revelation of Christ was the spark of life, but the body—bones, sinews, blood—was Jewish tradition. The early Fathers had the spark of life also. Not so fully, not so irresistibly, as St. Paul, but they had it. What they had not was his Rabbinic training. And if their poorer intellect and feebler comprehension of the life in Christ accounts for the contrast between them and St. Paul to some extent, this difference of training accounts for it much more. There were other things which helped to deepen the contrast. To the earliest Christians St. Paul's Epistles were not 'Scripture'; only the Old Testament books had that authority. Moreover, they were not greatly interested in literature of any kind. The end of the world was at hand; they had to be ready; they were practical rather than literary. Then came the heresies, the need of definitions and creeds, and the change in the conception of Faith as a personal relationship between a man and his Saviour into the correct recital of a certain form of words. It is a difficult matter. Mr. Means is open and candid. We do not know that he himself would claim more.

GOD'S OPEN DOORS.

Let us first congratulate the publishers (Messrs. A. & C. Black) on the attractiveness of the Rev. T. Rhondda Williams' volume of sermons. Other publishers have published him, but this excels them all. Then let us thank Mr. Williams for the fulness and strength of his sermons. They are

neither shallow nor short. Let us thank him also for the ideal they insist upon. Enoch walked with God—was that extraordinary? It was, but it is the extraordinary that we are invited to reach. Enoch walked with God on Sunday. He did, but also on Monday. And Mr. Williams makes his ideal attainable by the insistence of faith in Him who loved us and gave Himself for us. To walk with God is easy when we have taken the first steps together. The first steps are through washing the robes in the blood of the Lamb.

TEN YEARS IN A PORTSMOUTH SLUM.

It is a wonderful story that Father Dolling had to tell, and he told it wonderfully. The piquancy is in the personality; let us say in the frank insistence on the personality. Father Dolling is in all the work, on his own telling he is in all the work. And it was part of the man to be so frank about himself. Is it not always in this way that work is done for Christ—not in telling of one's share in it, but by being in it, by throwing oneself into it, by making the work centre round a personality? It is a wonderful book. For Father Dolling could write almost as well as he could speak and act. His book is published by Messrs. S. C. Brown Langham & Co. (6s.). It is illustrated throughout from photographs.

THE BLESSED VIRGIN IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.

Mr. Bernard St. John has written an account of the activity of the Virgin Mary during the last century, his book has received the imprimatur of the Vicar-Capitular, and it has been published by Messrs. Burns & Oates (6s.). The Virgin Mary was particularly active last century. Dr. Edmond Thiriet, who introduces the book, says that the nineteenth century might be called the *Siècle de Marie*. Her activity was shown mostly, indeed almost exclusively, in France. And, in order to cover the whole of her activity there, Mr. St. John has divided his book into six parts, and extended it to 486 pages.

How has the Virgin been at work? This quotation will explain. It is taken from the part of the book which deals with Lourdes: 'The supernatural is to be seen in its effects at Lourdes oftener than actually at work. But sometimes, in presence of the naked human eye, unsightly scales fall away and fresh flesh tissues are formed. A

case of this kind has been related to us by Madame X——, a *dame hospitalière* of Lourdes, as having come under her personal notice. It was that of Blanche Leclère, of Vincennes, belonging to the National Pilgrimage of 1898. This girl, who was seventeen years of age, was suffering from *lupus*. Her face, swollen and misshapen, was in wounds, her skin was of fiery redness, her features were partially eaten away, her whole aspect was revolting. On 22nd August, at the procession of the Blessed Sacrament, she experienced a feeling of burning in the affected parts, a certain sense of improvement in her condition followed, and remained with her, but this was all. The next day, as the hour of the departure of the members of the National Pilgrimage drew near, no one thought of classing her otherwise than as among the uncured. Suddenly, in St. Elizabeth's ward of the Hospital of Notre-Dame des Sept Douleurs, as Blanche Leclère was busying herself in putting her things together previous to her departure, the aspect of her face was seen to be changing. In presence of Madame X—— and of several others, the wounds healed, the incrustations fell away, while the skin resumed its natural colour, the face its proportions, and the features their form. This process of transformation lasted half an hour, at the end of which time no sign of the hideous disease remained, if we except a pink line round the girl's face showing whither the ravages of the *lupus* had extended. Blanche Leclère, on realizing her altered state, wept. As she raised her eyes to heaven, her first words were: "Oh, how good God is! Now I can earn my living."

Dr. Edmond Thiriet informs us that the special merit of Mr. St. John's book lies in the fact that 'the subject is not treated from the point of view of a devotee or of an *illuminé*, but from that of an historian, bent on a careful examination of facts that may be called contemporary.' And Dr. Thiriet must be right, because Mr. St. John's style is very bad, suitable perhaps for a historian, but quite unsuitable for a devotee or an *illuminé*.

HISTORY OF EGYPT.

Mr. Ross G. Murison, Lecturer on Oriental Languages in University College, Toronto, recently published a History of Assyria and Babylonia at a sixpence. It was a great venture. He risked his reputation for judgment on it as well as his scholarship and literary skill. Now he has written a

History of Egypt on the same scale, and it is published in the same 'Bible Class Primer' series (T. & T. Clark) at the same price. His venture has succeeded. This is how many persons begin to know anything about these lands. This is the accurate lucid way in which they demand that knowledge should be presented now.

FORERUNNERS OF DANTE.

'Behind the veil, behind the veil!' Its interest never flags. We wonder why Christ did not remove the veil. We may wonder more that where He did lift it a little we have profited so little by His revelation. We are intensely interested, but our interest is mostly selfish interest. We want to see Heaven and Hell that we may gain the one and escape the other, not that we may be fit for the inheritance of the saints in light.

Where they could not see, what have men imagined of the life to come? That question Mr. Marcus Dods has answered in this book. *Forerunners of Dante* (T. & T. Clark; 4s. net) is a good title, for it is the visions of gifted and earnest men that Mr. Dods considers, and that alone are worth considering. He begins with the thoughts which were held of the Unseen by the ancient Babylonians. He passes on through Greece and Rome to early Christianity. He has much to do with the 'Descent into Hell.' He closes with that most fruitful field of fantasy, the Mediæval Church.

Mr. Dods has chosen his subject well. He writes well upon it. How could he help that? His instincts are sound, and he has used industry. In all the writing that has yet to be written on the things beyond the Tomb Mr. Dods and his charming book will have to be considered.

Professor D. F. Kauffmann's admirable sketch of the myths of the ancient Teutons has been admirably translated into English by Miss M. Steele Smith of Newnham, and published by Messrs. Dent in their 'Temple Primers' series (1s. net), under the title of *Northern Mythology*.

THE MOTHERHOOD OF GOD.

This is certainly less usual as an epithet and a thought than is the Fatherhood of God, but Dr. Smythe Palmer can quote good Scripture for it. He can also show its influence among the natural religions and throughout the history of the world.

But the title of a later sermon in the book is more startling: 'God as a Grasshopper.' The text is Is 40²², 'It is he that sitteth upon the circle of the earth, and the inhabitants thereof are as grasshoppers.' The point of the title lies in the fact of the Incarnation. He to whom men are but as grasshoppers became Himself a man, took His place among the grasshoppers. It is clear that Dr. Smythe Palmer's preaching keeps the mind awake. There is also the hunger for the saving of the soul in it (Wells Gardner; 3s. 6d.).

WORK.

What has the Rev. Hugh Black to say about Work? It is not what he says, it is the atmosphere of sincerity—you might say the atmosphere of intensity—that he gathers round his words. He does not talk of the 'duty,' and the 'gospel' and the 'consecration' of work, he acts it, he makes the talk live and move and have its being in us. This is the power of the preacher. We can all say true and original things about work; Mr. Black can make us work (Hodder & Stoughton; 2s. 6d.).

BY THE RIVER CHEBAR.

The Rev. Elvet Lewis is a scholar and an expositor. Only he who is both gets anything out of Ezekiel now. You cannot 'spiritualize' him as Dr. Guthrie in his day. For the most part men have left him alone since the historical method came in. But here is Ezekiel made most profitable for the life of to-day, and not a metaphor ill-treated, not a phrase misapplied (Hodder & Stoughton; 3s. 6d.).

SUN-RISE.

Addresses from a City Pulpit by the Rev. G. H. Morrison, M.A. (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s.). Some preachers are successful in spite of their sermons, Mr. Morrison is successful because of them. They touch people, that is the secret of their success. They touch everybody. They do not need a certain progress in Christian experience; they do not appeal to a certain intellectual advance. They touch men as men. They touch human nature. Their appeal is to the humanity that makes us kin. Mr. Morrison's power is the power of a singer, only that the singer reaches best those who are most musical, while he reaches all. Listen to these sentences: 'It is the veiled figure in the crowd that rouses interest, and the beauty of nature is the veil of God.' 'And was there ever a mother

who was not quite convinced that her one-year-old was a most marvellous child?' 'What a poor thing is life when the wonder of it all passes away.'

Messrs. Macmillan have published a volume of prayers made and used by the late Bishop Westcott in his Harrow home (*Common Prayers for Family Use*; 1s. net). There are prayers for every day of the week, and every day's prayers are based on one of the petitions in the Lord's Prayer.

THE ENGLISH CHURCH.

The Dean of Winchester has not lived to see his great work finished. He planned this history of the English Church. He saw four volumes published. But four had still to come and he died. The work will go on, and it will be an enduring monument to Dean Stephens' memory. Another volume has just come out.

The new volume is written by Mr. W. H. Hutton. Its period lies between the accession of Charles I. and the death of Anne (Macmillan; 7s. 6d.). It is a most trying period. It was trying to those who had to make its history, and almost as trying to those who have to write it. Fortunately for Mr. Hutton a great and impartial historian has gone over the ground before him. Perhaps in one way Dr. Gardiner's marvellously fair work was no help. To be original at all the temptation must have been to take a side. But Mr. Hutton is really strong enough to use Dr. Gardiner and yet be himself. It is perhaps the most pleasing to read of all the volumes of the series.

JUDAISM AS CREED AND LIFE.

Three estimates of Judaism have lately been made public. One is immovably conservative. It is contained in two well-known volumes by Dr. M. Friedländer. One is audaciously and flagrantly liberal. It is Mr. Claude Montefiore's *Liberal Judaism*. And one occupies the *via media*. It is the Rev. Morris Joseph's *Judaism as Creed and Life* (Macmillan; 5s. net).

Mr. Joseph will thus appeal most successfully to the non-Jewish world. He is conscious of that. He discloses no secrets. His estimate of Judaism is a rosy one. He frankly says that it is Judaism at its very best, the ugly and irreconcilable in its history and teaching being simply ignored. In short, it is not Judaism, but what Judaism got to be in here a man and there a man, or at highest a

movement now and then. It is Judaism as seen by a Jew of to-day appreciatively.

And it is not false. For Judaism has made this Jew. He has therefore the right to give it credit for what it has enabled him to see to be good. And he is entitled, moreover, to recognize an evolution in its history, the useless being steadily dropped as the beautiful and the good were apprehended. He divides his book into three parts—Creed, Ceremonial, and Moral Life. The Old Testament student had better not neglect it. There is a way of looking at familiar things that makes them almost new.

CRABBE.

The latest issue of the new series of 'English Men of Letters' is Crabbe, by Alfred Ainger. We do not get excited over Crabbe nor over Alfred Ainger. We know what the one will say about what the other has said. That Crabbe deserves to be more read than he is, is certain; it is also certain that he never will be.

Canon Ainger has won an assured place among the literary men of our day, few have won it so legitimately. And it is part of the general folly of our modern life that we take more interest in the paradoxes and personalities of a G. K. Chesterton than in the temperate judgment and real scholarship of an Alfred Ainger. This volume of the new series of 'English Men of Letters' is the best volume of them all, and it will be least read of them all (Macmillan; 2s. net).

CHARLES HADDON SPURGEON.

Another Life of Spurgeon is no superfluity. Another Life was needed. The great Life is too great, too big, and too costly. Is this the kind of Life we needed? It is. This anonymous author has all the knowledge and all the sympathy, and he can write. One risk he avoids, the risk of making us think that Spurgeon spent his life telling stories or having stories told about him. There are stories in this book, new and good; but Spurgeon himself is in it chiefly, and he is greater than anecdotes can tell. Mr. Melrose has published the book cheaply (2s. 6d. net) and handsomely.

THE FIRST EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS.

Three volumes of Methuen's 'Westminster Commentaries,' edited by Dr. Walter Lock, have

now appeared—Gibson's *Job*, Rackham's *Acts*, and Goudge's *First Corinthians* (6s.). Dr. Lock must wish by this time he had not undertaken the editorship. Dr. Gibson, it is true, kept well in harness, and his commentary was a mild reflexion of Davidson. But Mr. Rackham broke all bounds in originality. And now here is Mr. Goudge, the Principal of Wells Theological College, telling his readers what *he* understands by the general editor's dictum that these commentaries 'will aim at combining a hearty acceptance of critical principles with loyalty to the Catholic Faith.' It is a nice thing to say, and its sound is full of comfort. But what if a commentator has to explain it and put his own meaning upon it? Mr. Goudge is far too original, far too good a scholar and commentator to be bound by such silken cords, and the result is that we have received a commentary on *First Corinthians* that will rank with Godet or Evans.

The commentator of *First Corinthians* must have the earliest post-apostolic literature at his finger ends, and he must be able to handle it without prejudice. Mr. Goudge is satisfactory in all that. Indeed, he is very bold, not abstaining from saying that here and there the evidence is against the Church tradition. But his boldness will be his salvation, for no body of persons who have agreed merely to be orthodox can gainsay the scholarship and the boldness with which this excellent commentator speaks.

RECOLLECTIONS OF JAMES MARTINEAU.

It is gratifying to see that the Rev. A. H. Craufurd, M.A., who writes this book (it is published by Mr. G. A. Morton, of Edinburgh, at 3s. 6d. net) agrees exactly with our estimate of Martineau's *Life and Letters*; but it is of more consequence that he says frankly, what we too have always felt, that Martineau was not a Unitarian by conviction, he was only born into Unitarianism. His personal creed was sometimes less than Unitarianism, but on the whole it was very much more. And the significant thing is that to him the denial of the divinity of Christ was never essential. Who is He, not what is He not; let us get up to Him, not bring Him down to us—that was almost always his express effort and encouragement. Mr. Craufurd's book makes that clearer than before. It is a tribute of affection, and there is head as well as heart in it. By all means read this book as well as the *Life and Letters*.

ENGLISH RELIGION IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY.

Canon Hensley Henson has most of the gifts that make the historian. Perhaps the one he lacks is patience—we mean historical patience, not personal. But he has vividness of imagination, fairness of mind, saneness of judgment, clearness of style. His new book is history—more after the Froude than the Freeman pattern, it is true; but we suppose nine read Froude with the personal equation while one reads Freeman without it.

The chapter to test Canon Henson is the chapter on 'The Presbyterian Experiment.' Most of our ecclesiastical historians have lost their heads there because they first lost their tempers. Canon Henson's title is not encouraging. It was no experiment. It was an outcome. It was no resolution of the people of England or any portion of them, saying, Go to, we have tried everything else, let us give Presbyterianism a trial now. It was inevitable. It came to the front, and was tried because it was the greatest moral force at the time. And some think that it was not tried longer because the English people had not moral capacity to hold its moral force. But let the title go. It is a great chapter. It is a revelation to Presbyterians of what Episcopalianism is capable of. It is a revelation to Episcopalians of what there is in Presbyterianism. Take the book all in all, it is real history. It misses much, it misjudges a little. But it palpitates with life. The dry bones of the seventeenth century are clothed with flesh, they have the breath in them, they stand upon their feet an exceeding great and interesting army (Murray; 6s. net).

There was a successful schoolmaster, one of the most successful, being one of the most enthusiastic in his profession, in the north of Scotland, where schoolmasters have been greater than in all the world beside,—he must be nameless, for he is not dead,—whose choicest prize for his choicest pupil was always Boswell's *Johnson*. He knew all the editions, and could select with judgment. What joy it would have been to him—it may be joy to him still, though he no longer awards prizes—had he seen Newnes' 'Thin Paper' edition. It is in two volumes, well printed in large type and opaque paper; it is bound in crimson leather, and it sells at 7s. net.

Mr. Torrey has found time in his travels to write notes on the International S.S. Lessons for 1904. *The Gist of the Lessons* he calls his little red-leather volume (Nisbet ; 1s. net).

PAROCHIAL SERMONS.

The author of the book with this modest title is the Rev. the Hon. W. E. Bowen, M.A. (Nisbet ; 3s. 6d. net). The author is modest as the title of his book. But he is in no doubt as to his ecclesiastical standing. He is *not* a High Churchman ; he is *not* a Broad Churchman ; he *is* an Evangelical. He knows that the remedy for the disease of sin, the uplifting from the degradation of selfishness, is the Cross of Christ. And he can think. One of his sermons is on the Power of the Resurrection. Give a man that subject to find out what he can see in the gospel. What was the Power of the Resurrection ? It was more things than one, but it was above everything else, says Mr. Bowen, 'that through the power of the Resurrection *the victory had passed from the side of sin to the side of righteousness.*'

SERMON OUTLINES.

No kind of printed matter can be more barren than sermon outlines. But these are sermon outlines that are instinct with life. This volume contains a great preacher's own outlines for the pulpit. To his eye the whole living, vitalizing sermon was in them. And, most happily, there is enough of outline, and it is vivid enough, to enable us also to see the sermon in our measure. The preacher is the late Rev. Henry Stevens, M.A., of Sydenham. The publisher is Messrs. Nisbet (3s. 6d. net).

THE DREAM OF DANTE.

Last month Messrs. Oliphant of Edinburgh gave us a fresh book on Browning, and gave it in the best style of printing and publishing. This month it is Dante, equally fresh, and equally charming as a book. The subject is the Inferno. The author is the Rev. Henry F. Henderson, M.A., of Dundee (2s. 6d. net).

Mr. Henderson's subject is the Inferno. His address is to the young man or woman with a life to live, unacquainted with Dante's Inferno ; unacquainted yet with any inferno ; still hoping to escape. So it is not solely nor mainly as a work of art that Dante's Dream is dealt with. Spiritual guidance is sought in it, moral bracing. 'I think,'

says Mr. A. J. Butler, in a note to the author, 'I think you have satisfactorily brought out that Righteousness, *justitia*, is the great object for which Dante is always contending, and that its contrary, *cupidigia*, is the source of all wickedness.' To gain Mr. Butler's approbation is enough.

A new book by the Rev. C. H. Spurgeon is not due to spiritualistic media. Spiritualism has not added so much as this to the wisdom of the world. It is simply the lucky discovery of a manuscript actually written by the prince of preachers when he sojourned among us. It is Spurgeon's way with the immortal pilgrim. *Pictures from Pilgrim's Progress* is the title (Passmore & Alabaster ; 3s. 6d.). And Bunyan was never turned to more triumphant evangelical uses.

ROME IN MANY LANDS.

The title indicates the tone of the book. There is no compromise. Is there good in Roman Catholicism ? If there is, it is hidden for the Rev. C. S. Isaacson, M.A., behind the evil. Rome in many lands, and in every land a curse. There is no hope of converting Romanists, there is no clear desire. The desire is to warn Protestants not to think that it is nothing if Romanism is prosperous in their midst (R.T.S. ; 2s. 6d.).

LIGHT AND LIFE.

The Religious Tract Society exercises great caution in the publication of sermons. There is a presumption in favour of a volume of sermons bearing the familiar three letters on the back. But they never published a better volume than this. Its evangelical fervour is matched by the limpidity of its style ; one recalls St. Paul, another St. John. But spiritual felicity of thought is its best quality, and that comes directly from fellowship with the mind of the Master. There is in the volume also the sense that it is a volume of sermons, that the Rev. Charles Brown is greater as a preacher than as a writer.

THE REPROACH OF CHRIST.

This volume of sermons by the Rev. W. J. Dawson, arrives with an introduction from Dr. Newell Dwight Hillis (Revell ; 3s. net). What does this shrewd American man of letters think of Mr. Dawson ? He says he is a versatile man, doing many things and doing them all well. He

calls him a student of English literature, a novelist, a poet and dramatist, a lecturer, an editor, and a preacher. 'Above all else,' he says, 'a preacher, persuading men to righteousness and the life of Jesus Christ.' Dr. Hillis heard the sermon that names the volume, and read others that it contains, and persuaded Mr. Dawson to publish. He persuaded him to publish this volume for the good of America. The publishers wisely issue it here for our good also. We know Mr. Dawson. His books need no introduction to us. The independence of his mind sometimes produces startling results in the field of exegesis, but he thinks and makes us think.

THE FUTURE STATE.

In his new 'Oxford Church Text-Book' (Rivingtons; 1s. net), Vice-Principal Gayford represents the position regarding the things beyond death of the moderate High Churchman of to-day. He is a scholar, and that restrains idiosyncrasy. He is in earnest, and that excludes speculation. How vastly does the attitude of a High Churchman differ from that of, say, a Presbyterian? Why is it that there should be so wide a gulf fixed here? The difference in the Sacraments is trifling in comparison.

THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER.

Messrs. Rivingtons' Handbooks are meant for teachers. They are practical. They are written by teachers. They are meant to be taught. The volume on the Book of Common Prayer has been committed to Prebendary Reynolds (4s. 6d.). Utterly unattractive to the casual reader's eye as it is, we can imagine the joy with which the eye of the trained and earnest teacher will fall upon its pages. Here are black type, parallel column, blackboard sketch, and all the instruments of modern religious instruction. It is also an accurate book and unbiassed.

An addition has been made to the literature of Missions, which is as real as it is unexpected. It is a *Short Account of the Historical Development and Present Position of Russian Orthodox Missions* (Rivingtons; 3s. 6d. net). The author is the very Rev. Eugene Smirnov, Chaplain to the Imperial Russian Embassy in London.

Mr. James Robinson keeps turning out his

volumes of sermons. This month there are two. One is on the *Parables of Jesus* (6s. net), the other on the *Miracles of Jesus* (6s. net). Each is the work of many hands, and the miscellaneousness is atoned for by the individual excellence.

THE CHILDREN'S YEAR.

Fifty-two short addresses to boys and girls by the Rev. J. Morgan Gibbon (Robinson; 3s. 6d. net). Mr. Gibbon's motto is Henry Vaughan's fine lines from *Childe-hood*—

Dear, harmless age! the short, swift span
Where weeping virtue parts with man.
An age of mysteries! which he
Must live twice that would God's face see.

And his book never loses the sense of the mysteries or their sweetness. It is not the ordinary clever acrobatic boys' and girls' sermon. There are no unexpected texts unexpectedly expounded. The virtue is in the atmosphere; that is always invigorating, always pure.

THE SILENT CHRIST.

One of our authors this month complains of the poverty of the preaching in one great Church in the land. The pews are empty because the preaching is poor, he says. Is there not this cause also, that we preach so many things that are of no account? Why do we not preach Christ, and why do we not preach Christ always. Is He exhaustible? Here is a preacher who has found a whole winter's series of sermons in Christ's silence. Think how that will tell on the tongue, arresting sins of speech that are so great a part of our sinning, while every sermon is charged with interest to every hearer. We see no brilliancy of literary or rhetorical skill, yet we are steadily drawn to deeper interest as the sermons proceed. The author is the Rev. W. W. Sidey; the publishers are Messrs. Simpkin, Marshall, & Co.

Mr. J. Fitzgerald Lee, in *The Greater Exodus* (Elliot Stock; 6s. net), endeavours to connect the Exodus from Egypt with the world-wide movement by which men have been fruitful and multiplied and replenished the earth, but the task is too great for him. His identification of the Edomites or Red men with the Red Indians of North America requires only a few strokes of the pen, but the ink is wasted.

The present Archbishop of Canterbury may not possess the piquant personality of Dr. Temple. But he is a great man and a Scot. And it was a fine thought as well as a labour of love for the Rev. Adam Philip, M.A., of Longforgan, to search out the whole history of *The Ancestry of Randall Thomas Davidson, D.D.*, and publish a delightful 'Chapter in Scottish Biography' (Elliot Stock). Many historians in the days to come will have recourse to Mr. Philip's beautiful and absolutely reliable volume.

More and more is the Missionary to the heathen coming to recognize the use of studying the heathen's religion. It is significant that the Rev. T. E. Slater, one of the L.M.S. men in India, has been able to publish a scientific book on Modern Hinduism; it is more significant that his book has reached a second edition (*The Higher Hinduism in Relation to Christianity*; Elliot Stock; 6s.). There is a certain lack of warmth in the writing, but Mr. Slater's accuracy and fairness are above reproach.

Mr. Elliot Stock has also published a small but precious volume under the title of *Eternal Life* (2s. 6d.), to which we wish to return. Its author is Mr. R. Somervell, M.A.

THE DECADENCE OF PREACHING.

The Rector of Taddington says that the Church of England has the most cultured clergy and the worst preachers in the world. Why do people stay away from church? Dr. Harold Ford's answer is ready: Because of the utter unattractiveness of the pulpit. Put a good preacher into the pulpit and the church will be thronged with people. So Dr. Ford has written a book (Elliot Stock; 2s. 6d. net) to show the unattractive preacher how to become attractive. His hints are many and wise, but the hint of hints lies in this incident: At a recent Church Congress one of the speakers asked if it was a fact that the late Bishop Creighton rejected several candidates for ordination because, although they knew all the details of ritual, and were familiar with Roman devotional books, they knew scarcely anything of the Bible?

Mr. Stockwell has published this month: (1) *Place the Umpire*, by the Rev. D. L. Ritchie of Newcastle-upon-Tyne (2s. 6d. net); (2) *Times and Seasons*, by the Rev. J. Morgan Gibbon (2s. 6d.

net); (3) *The Duty of Exercise*, by the Rev. John Pandy Williams (2s. 6d. net)—three volumes of sermons.

THE TREE OF LIFE.

It is said that the last thing a preacher should trust to is the possession by his congregation of the historical imagination. It may be the last thing he should trust to their having already, but why not give it them? Why not take them with him to the house in Galilee where the four friends of the sick man uncovered the roof, and let them see the bed descending in the midst where Jesus was? Why not take them to the Garden of Eden itself and let them see Adam and Eve walking and talking with God there in the cool of the day? It can be done. The Rev. J. M'Kinney, M.A., Vicar of St. Silas's, Liverpool, does it. He has done it in all the sermons in his volume, *The Tree of Life* (Thynne; 2s. 6d.); and, as a consequence, we are quietly in the presence of Jesus and feel His power.

Messrs. Williams & Norgate have imported and issued in this country the first part of Cabrol's *Dictionnaire d'Archéologie Chrétienne et de Liturgie*. It is a work of the first importance. The part which has reached us carries the titles only from 'A-Ω' to 'Accusations contre les Chrétiens'; yet it contains 287 closely printed imperial octavo pages. The best French scholars are contributors; every article is signed; and there is a welcome wealth of illustration. Nothing has yet been done in this country for the Church on the same scale or with the same array of scholarship. Perhaps our day will come. In the meantime it must be understood that no one who has work to do in Christian Archæology or Liturgics can afford to neglect this great book. Taken along with Vigouroux's *Dictionnaire de la Bible* and Vacant-Mangenot's *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique*, it represents an interest in Christian science and an enterprise in furthering it that puts even Germany to shame.

Christmas Books.

MESSRS. BLACKIE have published no fewer than six books for boys this Christmas season. They are—

With the Allies to Peking. By G. A. Henty. 6s.

Through Three Campaigns. By G. A. Henty. 6s.

In Search of the Okapi. By Earnest Glanville. 6s.
Foes of the Red Cockade. By Captain F. S. Brereton. 6s.
The Disputed V.C. By Frederic F. Gibbon. 5s.
Tom Burnaby. By Herbert Strang. 5s.

We are pleased to see that two of the volumes are by Mr. Henty. Our boys will prize these last works of his as coming from an old friend, whose hand had lost none of its cunning. *Through Three Campaigns* is a story of Chitral, Tirah, and Ashantee. It is handsomely bound in scarlet, with the olive edges which Messrs. Blackie use so effectively. *With the Allies to Peking* is bound in bright green and red. Both books have the usual characteristics of all Mr. Henty's writing—accurate history and an exciting plot. The time which our boys spend in reading them will not be wasted.

In Search of the Okapi.—The okapi, in search of which Mr. Glanville's heroes go, is a 'dwarfed giraffe, part zebra.' The three adventurers go out to Central Africa to find this animal, and there have many strange experiences, not the least of which is their discovery of the Valley of Rest.

Whoever designed the cover of *Foes of the Red Cockade* is to be congratulated. A man's figure in black stands out from the vivid red background. A dash of yellow at the top and bright gilt lettering complete the effect. Nor will any boy be disappointed when he gets to the story.

In *The Disputed V.C.* we have the story of two lads, Ted Russell the hero and Harry Tynan, both of whom went through the Indian Mutiny. The plot of the book is a strong one. It turns on Tynan's dishonourable attempts to gain credit for a brave action of Russell's, which at length gained for him the V.C.

The motto of *Tom Burnaby* is—

What good gift have my brothers, but it came
 From search, and strife, and loving sacrifice?

The story of the book bears out the motto. Mr. Sheldon has done his part with the illustrations. They are many and well executed. They arrest the eye and make one wish to possess the book, which is handsomely bound in dark green and yellow.

The Girl's Own Reciter and the Boy's Own Reciter.

From the R.T.S. have come two books, bulky and ugly, but sure of a wide welcome. One is *The Girl's Own Reciter* (2s. 6d.), edited by Mr. Charles Peters; the other is *The Boy's Own Reciter* (2s. 6d.), edited by Mr. George Andrew Hutchison. They seem alike; they are different. The girl's book is made up of ancient favourites from Byron and Thomas Campbell, with a sprinkling of more modern literature. The other is altogether modern and original. The 'pieces' are reprinted from the *Boy's Own Paper*, and they give eloquent testimony to the literary talent which that popular weekly commands. But the best thing in either book is Mr. James J. Dodd's introduction to the *Boy's Own Reciter* on 'Recitations and How to Recite.' It furnishes both entertainment and edification, as the deacon said of the stranger's sermon.

In the Land of Ju-Ju.

In the Land of Ju-Ju, by Robert Leighton (Melrose; 5s.). This makes the third book by Mr. Leighton that we

have reviewed within two months. But in his case, quantity and quality go together. *In the Land of Ju-Ju* is a tale of the City of Benin—the city of blood. The hero is Duncan Ross, a Scotch lad who was disowned by his father through a misunderstanding, and who went out to West Africa to gain his own living. How he went with Mr. Phillip's ill-fated expedition to Benin, and the sufferings he endured before he was rescued are all told by Mr. Leighton. There is not a dull chapter in the book.

Another parcel has come from the S.P.C.K. containing eight volumes—

Spurs and Bride. By Gertrude Hollis. 2s. 6d.
Granny's Brocade. By Helen Oxenborough. 2s.
The Wrecker's Farm. By Elizabeth Harcourt Mitchell. 2s.
A Step in the Dark. By Catharine E. Mallandaine. 1s. 6d.
Mr. Tiller's Magazine. By Rev. E. R. Grotto, M.A. 1s. 6d.
The Island of Refuge. By C. A. Mercer. 1s. 6d.
As the Twig is Bent. By Phoebe Allan. 1s.
Mark or Molly? By H. Erlington. 1s.

Of these *The Island of Refuge* and *Mark or Molly* are written for children. *The Island of Refuge* is the story of four children—Walter, Marjory, Joan, and Dick—who went to live in the country with a grand-uncle and aunt while their father and mother were abroad. They are merry, mischievous children, and keep the old people very lively. They are given a small piece of ground, surrounded with water, and this they call the Island of Refuge. On this island all animals are to be safe. A bear and a runaway boy were two of the 'animals' that took refuge.

Mark or Molly? is the story of a little boy who got the nickname of Miss Molly from his brothers, because once when he was very young, as he pathetically says, he ran away from a donkey. Mark is only nine when the tale begins. His one object is to prove his own courage. One day a real opportunity came to him, and Mark seized it, and that was how he lost for ever the nickname of Miss Molly. This book would make a splendid prize for the younger children. It is brightly bound in yellow and blue.

Granny's Brocade is the very book we have been looking for, to give to our elder girls. Miss Oxenborough has the gift of making her characters live before the reader's eyes. Agatha Digby, the heroine, is a bright unselfish girl. It does us good to follow her footsteps, and see that 'There's a Divinity that shapes our ends, rough hew them how we will.'

Spurs and Bride is a story of England in the days of King John. Miss Hollis has spared no pains to make her book a true picture of England as it was at the time of Magna Charta. No boy after reading it could call the history of that time uninteresting.

We often find it very difficult to get suitable reading for our mothers' meetings and mission gatherings. The S.P.C.K. have provided us with four volumes which meet this need. They are—*The Wrecker's Farm*, *A Step in the Dark*, *Mr. Tiller's Magazine*, and *As the Twig is Bent*. The last shows us that 'honesty which is practised because it is the best policy may be honesty, but not of the

best kind.' In the *Wrecker's Farm* we have the story of how a proud and unforgiving old man was gradually softened. *A Step in the Dark* is the record of a woman's impulsive act, which spoiled some years of her life, but she could say with Browning—

True I have lost so many years; what then?
Many remain; God has been very good.

Via Dolorosa.

Via Dolorosa is a Roman Catholic story. It describes vividly the life of a Roman Catholic priest, first in the seminary of St. Sulpice, and later in a charge in Paris. Surely the author, who signs himself a 'North Country Curate,' has himself studied at St. Sulpice. One character is convincingly described, namely, Henri de St. Pierre, who, from being a practical infidel, becomes Père Hippolyte, the most devoted of priests. He travels along the *Via Dolorosa*, and at the end is enabled to say, 'consummatum est.' Messrs. Sands are the publishers, and the price is 6s.

Nature—Curious and Beautiful.

From the R.T.S. has also come *Nature—Curious and Beautiful*, by Richard Kerr (3s. 6d.). The book is divided into twenty-five chapters, each of which deals with one or more of nature's curiosities. One chapter, for example, contains a description of the Teasel, the Pitcher Plant, and Venus's Fly-Trap. Their peculiarities are pointed out shortly; too shortly we feel. We wish Mr. Kerr had given us fewer subjects and more of each.

The book is written not only to instruct naturalists however, it is also intended to teach a moral lesson. In his conclusion the author tells us plainly that his object is to show the reader 'evidences of a Power overruling even the humblest organism or the simplest crystal—a Power that produces marvellous designs in the animate and in the inanimate, and that controls the laws which govern their development.'

Jane Eyre.

The second volume of Blackie's 'Library of Great Novelists' has just come. It is *Jane Eyre*. The volumes of this series are published at the uniform price of 2s. 6d. They are printed on good paper, with clear type, and an attractive cover design in dark red and gold. Messrs. Blackie's aim in producing this series is to include representative works of all the greatest writers of fiction, and we are pleased to see that Mrs. Craik, Mrs. Gaskell, George Borrow, and others are not to be forgotten.

The Bondage of Ballinger.

The Bondage of Ballinger is a book of much charm. The hero is a New Englander, and his wife, Hannah, is a quaint little Quaker, so we expect quiet movement and no excitement. The 'bondage' that held Ballinger in thrall; was none of the ordinary passions, but a passion all the same. He was a book-buyer and a book-lover; and this passion for rare books and first editions meant many a sacrifice in the home; but Hannah is patient, tender, and comprehending. Ballinger has another staunch friend besides his wife—

the daughter of a wealthy merchant, who comes to his aid as we fear collapse. She had tasted rare joys in the old man's den among his literary treasures, and she rejoices when the opportunity comes to bring peace and comfort to his old age.

Donny's Captain.

All over the country Bands of Hope are to be found. Almost every little village has its branch. Most of us have experienced the difficulty of getting books suitable either to give to the children as prizes, or to read aloud to them in the meetings. The R.T.S. removed this difficulty when they published *Donny's Captain*, by E. Livingston Prescott (2s.). Unfortunately the cover of the book is not so bright as the book itself.

The Conscience of Roger Trehern.

Evelyn Everett-Green has written many books—children's stories, adventure stories for boys, stories for girls, and novels. *The Conscience of Roger Trehern* (3s. 6d.) can be classed with none of these. We might, perhaps, call it the study of a man's mind. Roger Trehern is designed for the Ministry, but at the last moment he draws back because he has not felt the 'call.' He cannot say that he is 'inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost . . . to serve God for the promoting of His glory, and the edifying of His people.' Without this experience Roger Trehern dare not become a clergyman. Miss Everett-Green has shown searching insight into character. Those who read her book will not soon forget it. Her publishers are the R.T.S.

From Messrs. Nelson have come a parcel of handsome Christmas books—

In Jacobite Days. By Mrs. Henry Clarke. 5s.

Beggars of the Sea. By Tom Bevan. 3s. 6d.

Won in Warfare. By Charles R. Kenyon. 2s. 6d.

The Gayton Scholarship. By Herbert Hayens. 1s. 6d.

The Little Brown Linnet. By Sheila E. Braine. 1s.

In Jacobite Days is a tale of the landing of King William at Torbay. It is supposed to be the autobiography of Gilbert Lane written long years after the events occurred. Many were the strange adventures this Gilbert experienced sheltering fugitives, and all of them he wrote down for the benefit of his grandchild. The book is tastefully bound in dark red and gold.

In *Beggars of the Sea* we have left England. We are in Holland, and it is the time of the Dutch struggle with Spain. Our sympathies are entirely with the Dutchmen and with William the 'silent' Duke. We cannot exactly say who is the hero of the book; there seem to be three—Dirk Dirkzoon, a Dutchman, who cares only for revenge; Boughton, an Englishman; and Simon Renard, one of the 'Beggars of the Sea.' These are in many perils—sometimes by sea and sometimes by land—but they effect an escape; how, the boy reader will find out for himself.

In *Won in Warfare* we are still farther from home. We are in Eastern Tennessee. After we have read this book we can no longer say that all Indians are rude savages,—Ellinipsico has proved that a Red Indian can be as faithful and brave as any white man. The plot is exciting and well worked out.

Mr. Hayens has surely made a new departure in *The*

Gayton Scholarship. He has written a school story. He has been quite as successful, however, in describing school life as he ever was in describing strange adventures in foreign lands. Every boy will find the humour of 'the angel'—who was not an angel—irresistible.

At last we have a story for the girls—*The Little Brown Linnet*. We wonder why the boys should have so much more than their share of the good things. *The Little Brown Linnet*, however, is one of the sweetest stories we have read, and will make up for much. The book is bound in brown, with a picture of the 'linnet' on the cover.

Neither have Messrs. Nelson forgotten the bairns. For them has come *Silver Bubbles* (3s. 6d.). One side of each page is occupied by a large coloured picture, and on the other side are the verses telling about the picture. Those who would like to see Ann who blew a big bubble—red, orange, and green—and little boy Black, who gets a fresh soot each day but never looks clean, must get *Silver Bubbles*.

There are also two smaller books, both crammed full of bright pictures. These are *Our Dogs* and *The Doll's House*.

'It is Finished.'

John xix. 30.

IN the Greek it is one word (τετέλεσται). Perhaps it is the greatest word that was ever spoken. And it was probably spoken triumphantly. It is the sixth of the seven 'sayings on the Cross.' Of the fifth and seventh it is said that they were spoken 'with a loud voice.' We may think of this also as spoken in a loud triumphant voice.

What does it mean? That something was ended? His life, for example, or His sufferings? No, the word means more than 'ended.' Five times in the course of His ministry the word is used by our Lord of Himself (Lk 12⁵⁰ 18³¹ 22⁸⁷, Jn 19²⁸). In every other place but this it is translated 'accomplished' in the Authorized Version. It was probably merely for the sake of variety that it was not translated 'accomplished' here. It means more than ended. The year 1903 and the 19th century are ended, but has their promise been fulfilled? Have we accomplished the work that we were given to do?

But what was accomplished?—

1. *His earthly life.* Two things had been especially given Him to do in His earthly life, and He had accomplished both. The one was *never to sin*. He had accomplished that. He had been tempted keenly, but He had never yielded; and at the close of His life He could say that He had never sinned, no, not once. Was He alone sent into the world to commit no sin? We make a mistake if we think so. What do the commandments mean?—*Thou shalt not*. One day we shall have ended our earthly life, shall we also have accomplished it? Shall it be said of us, as it ought to be said, 'He did no sin, neither was guile found in His mouth'?

He was to love and *never cease from loving*.

He accomplished that. He loved the publicans and sinners; He loved even the Pharisees, His denunciation of their hypocrisy was due to His love of them. He loved Jerusalem when He said, 'How often would I have gathered thy children together!'—and Jerusalem had rejected Him then. Was He alone sent into the world to love? No, but it was easier for Him. Was it easier? He knew what was *in* man, not merely what came out of Him. He marvelled at the hardness of men's hearts; we scarcely see it. They brought before Him the woman taken in adultery—did they feel the enormity of the transgression as He did? Yet He loved and loved until in many cases He was loved back again. And even when He was not, He never ceased loving. He had accomplished His life. He had never sinned, He had never ceased to love.

2. *His suffering.* 'It is finished'—it was a loud cry. Should we be wrong to say it was a cry of relief as well as of triumph? The deepest experience of all His suffering was just past. The cry, 'My God, my God,' had just been uttered. Should we be wrong in saying that it was partly the gladness of relief?

But we should certainly be wrong if we took it to mean that He was glad His suffering was *ended*. Do you think that the only way to look at suffering is to bear it and get rid of it as soon as possible? You do not know what suffering can do for you. You do not know what it can do through you for those around. There is no more gentle angel of mercy than suffering. There is none that descends more immediately from the Father. Jesus had not only ended His suffering, He had accomplished it. It had done its work in Him. He had been made

by it a perfect Captain of our salvation. And it had wrought its work through Him on us. Henceforth men shall always look on Him whom they pierced, and the look will bring both sorrow for sin and endurance under suffering.

3. *His work.* This was what was accomplished chiefly. He had started with a sense of having a work to do. Even in boyhood He had said, 'Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business?' He had felt the pressure of it all through His life. 'I have a baptism to be baptized with, and how am I straitened till it be accomplished.' He had ended His life in the calm confidence that He had accomplished it. 'I have glorified Thee on the earth, I have accomplished the work which Thou gavest me to do.'

There is no good done without a purpose in life. Of every one of us it stands true: 'There was a man sent from God, whose name was' so and so. Have we seen that life is a few hours sunlight in which to work the works of Him that sent us? When the night cometh shall we be able to say, 'I have finished the work which Thou gavest me to do'? We fear, perhaps, that this would make life too serious or too sombre? He enjoyed His work. 'My meat,' He said, 'is to do the will of Him that sent Me, and to finish His work.' The workman may sing at His work all the day long.

But what was His work?

(1) It was glorifying God. He said, 'I have glorified Thee on the earth, I have finished the work which Thou gavest Me to do.' And what is glorifying God? It is letting men see Him just as He is. Jesus had done that. Jesus had never once sinned, and never once ceased to love; and then when they were impressed with that and loved Him, He said, 'I and the Father are one.' He loves as I do, 'God so loved the world.' Men take their idea of God from those who name the name of God. Do we glorify Him? Do we show Him as He is? We speak of Him as a Father, do we trust Him? Do we draw others to Him?

(2) It was also fulfilling Scripture. Again and again, when He did this or that, we are told it was 'that the Scripture might be fulfilled.' The prophets had prophesied certain things of Him. He fulfilled their prophecies. Among the rest they had prophesied, 'Surely he hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows.' He healed the sick, and cleansed the leper, and preached the gospel to the poor. They had prophesied, 'He was wounded for our transgressions, He was bruised for our iniquities, the chastisement of our peace was upon Him, and by His stripes we are healed.' And He read it, He read it and said, 'Of whom speaketh the prophet this?' and answered, 'Of Me, of Me.' This was His work—to suffer, the just for the unjust, and bring many sons to glory,—and He knew it.

(3) So His work can be summed up in one great word Redemption. He came to give His life a ransom, and He had done it. This was the work that the Father gave Him to do, and He had accomplished it.

He had accomplished it for all His Church. His cry, 'It is finished,' did not merely look back on the work of the earthly life. He took His stand, as He uttered it, at the end of the world's history. He saw many of all nations gathered in. He saw them around the throne. 'It is finished' He said, with prophetic voice.

And yet more, He looked on every one. It was not merely that He saw congregation after congregation gathered for true worship, then laid beneath the sod, the redeemed being received into glory; He saw one after another, one beside another, He saw them singly; He knew them one by one, He called them all by name.

So even we also, at the end of our life, can say, not only 'It is ended,' but 'It is accomplished.' For we can say, 'I lay my sins on Jesus,' and in Him we have the benefit of His accomplishment. 'I in them and Thou in Me, that they also may be made perfect in us.'

Contributions and Comments.

The Scene of the Sacrifice of Isaac.

THE expression, ארץ המריה (Gn 22²), involves several well-known difficulties; among them the absence of any other evidence of the existence of a district called the 'Land of Moriah' (an inherent improbability, if the temple hill be meant; and there seems no trace of any other locality of the same name). The hill called Moriah is comparatively insignificant, and surrounded by others, some higher than itself. It is not likely that such a hill should give its name to a district.

Moreover, it is not obvious why Abraham should have felt moved to offer a sacrifice to Yahweh on a high place, which, if sacred at all, would certainly be consecrated to the local Ba'al of the Jebusites.

I do not know whether anyone has suggested reading מדין or perhaps המדינים, 'Midian,' or 'the Midianites,' for המריה. The change involved would be comparatively slight, both in the Old Hebrew and the square character. It would obviate the topographical difficulty, and would locate the sacrifice of Abraham in the district of Sinai or Horeb, where we would expect to find Yahweh-worship. The change might be introduced by accident, or by the design of a scribe, who perhaps wished to correct what he took for an anachronism—Midian being, according to Gn 25, a later-born son of Abraham himself. The chief obstacle in the way of the suggested reading is the expression, 'on the third day,' in v. 4. This suits the reading of the text, but would not agree with the new reading, the journey involved being considerably longer. The difficulty can, I confess, be avoided only by invoking the usual *Deus ex machina*, the hypothesis of an interpolated gloss!

R. A. STEWART MACALISTER.

Abu Shushkeh, Ramleh, Palestine.

Tamar.

TAMAR is called 'a Canaanite woman' in the *D.B.* iv. 676. Where are we told that she was a Canaanite? Just the contrary is stated by the author of the so-called *Opus Imperfectum in Mattheum* (on Mt 1³): 'Primus filius Judæ, cum

Judas, suo ipsius experimento exterritus, nolisset ei accipere conjugem ex filiabus Chananæorum, sed dedisset ei *Thamar ex filiabus Aram*, mater autem ejus, cum esset Chananæa, hortaretur eum accipere ex genere suo, ille consilio matris usus non contigit eam.'

The same statement is found in the *Testament of Judah*: Θάμαρ ἐκ Μεσοποταμίας, θυγατέρα Ἀράμ; and in the *Book of Jubilees*, chap. 41, 'a wife from the daughters of Aram, named Tamar.'

In *Ps.-Jon.*, on Gn 38^{6, 24}, she is called a priest's daughter, and thus in other Jewish sources.

I publish this statement, because R. H. Charles, in his new edition of the *Book of Jubilees*, is not aware that the *Opus Imperfectum* also belongs to the Christian works which betray a knowledge of the *Book of Jubilees*.

EB. NESTLE.

Maulbronn.

Mark iv. 12.

PROFESSOR NESTLE says that none of the commentators at his disposal quote the fact that the Targum and Peshito of Is 6¹⁰ offer the very same reading as St. Mark. He asks, 'Is there really no one who has noticed this before?' and I think it is only fair to several of our older commentators to say they have not overlooked this interesting coincidence. Take, for instance, two on the Old Testament and two on the New. Dr. Henderson, in his commentary on Isaiah, says: 'Healing and forgiveness of sins came to be regarded as synonymous—hence after the Targum וְיִשְׁתַּבֵּק the words are thus paraphrased in Mk 4¹², καὶ ἀφεθῇ αὐτοῖς τὰ ἁμαρτήματα, though in the parallel passages, ἰάσονται of the LXX is retained.'

Dr. Alexander on Is 6¹⁰ says: 'Instead of *heal*, the Targum and Peshito have *forgive*, which is substituted likewise in the quotation, or rather allusion to this verse in Mk 4¹².'

Dr. John Gill says the sense of the phrase in St. Mark 'is justified by the Chaldee paraphrase, which renders it וְיִשְׁתַּבֵּק לָהֶם = and it be forgiven them—and by a Jewish commentator on the place, who interprets healing of the soul וְהָיָה הַסְּלִיחָה = and this is pardon.'

Dr. Rudolf Stier also quotes the Targum and Kimchi to the same effect.

AUGUSTUS POYNDER.

Cheltenham.

The Destination of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

THE suggestion that is made in this paper can only claim for itself a contingent probability, inasmuch as it is bound up with a particular theory of the authorship of the Epistle. It depends entirely on the view that the writer was Barnabas.

Without attempting to enter on a discussion of the vexed question of authorship, the conviction may be reiterated that—in spite of recent theories—the claim of Barnabas still continues to possess the greatest share of probability. Harnack's theory that it represents the combined work of Aquila and Priscilla, is ingenious, and undoubtedly has great plausibility. But in favour of Barnabas there is the explicit testimony of Tertullian; there is the peculiar position of Barnabas, on the one hand a Levite who might be expected to take such a view of Jewish ritual as the Epistle presents, on the other hand an intimate member of the Pauline circle; there is the fact that a Hellenistic Jew might be expected to make such use of the Septuagint as is made in the Epistle; and there is the fact that Barnabas stood so high in the early Church as to be well able to use the tone of authoritative rebuke which the Epistle conveys.¹ It should also be borne in mind that this view is supported by the powerful advocacy of Renan, Zahn, and Salmon. Weiss, too, says: 'This view is certainly the only one that has every probability in its favour.'

But the question of the destination has its own peculiar difficulties. Westcott, who leaves the authorship an open question, holds that the internal evidence of the Epistle points to Jerusalem or some Christian community in the neighbourhood as the destination. It has been felt that the person who could speak to so important a church in tones of such authority and reproof *must* have possessed great influence in the early Church, and

Mr. Ayles (*op. cit.* p. 88) declares that 'Barnabas here, as elsewhere, exactly answers to the requirements of the problem.'

Recently there seems to be a consensus of opinion that Palestine must be given up. Davidson, for example, says, 'some community of the Dispersion in the East,—not, however Jerusalem, nor any church in its immediate neighbourhood,—with a Hellenistic type of Judaism, best suits the circumstances of the case.' Still more recent opinion seems to converge on Italy as the probable destination. There is much to be said for this too. But the immediate point is, that none of these suggestions is incompatible with the authorship of Barnabas.

If, however, we may for the moment take his authorship for granted, I wish to throw out a suggestion about the destination which seems to me to be more probable. It is this: that the Epistle was written by Barnabas from Italy to some Christian community *in his own island home, Cyprus*.

Let us see how many requirements of the problem are satisfied by this theory.

It has been pointed out by Davidson that certain passages (2³ 10³²) seem to show that the hearers received the gospel from apostolic missionaries, and that this evangelization is referred to as a distinct historical event. (Such seems to be the significance of the aorist *φωτισθέντες* 10³².) Now the first reference that we have in *Acts* to the evangelization of Cyprus is in 11¹⁹: 'They therefore that were scattered abroad upon the tribulation that arose about Stephen travelled as far as Phœnicia, and Cyprus, and Antioch, speaking the word to none save only to Jews.'² It may be that these first missionaries carried to the island a type of Christianity distinctly representing Stephen's teaching. Certainly, on the second occasion when Christianity was taken to the island—by Paul and Barnabas on the first missionary journey—it was carried by men who were both probably strongly influenced by Stephen's teaching. In this connexion it is interesting to recall the fact that, as Ritschl has pointed out, the influence of Stephen in this Epistle is clearly marked—not merely in details, but in its main idea. Mr. Ayles has worked out in detail the resemblance between the eleventh chapter of the Hebrews and Stephen's speech, and the striking similarity cannot be

¹ The case for the authorship of Barnabas has been ably and fully put by the Rev. H. H. B. Ayles, B.D., in his book, *Destination, Date, and Authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews*, 1899. He regards Jerusalem as the destination.

² He 10^{33b} may possibly refer to this visit of Christian fugitives from Jerusalem.

denied. The conclusion of this line of thought is, that both Barnabas the writer of the Epistle and his hearers in Cyprus were trained in a type of Christianity which owed its peculiar character to the influence of Stephen.

It is said in the Epistle (2⁴) that when the readers received the gospel, God bore witness 'both by signs and wonders, and by manifold powers.' The record of the missionary journey through Cyprus contains at least one example of such 'wonders' in the inflection of blindness on Elymas; and there may have been others which Luke omits.

We know that Barnabas returned to work in Cyprus after his separation from Paul, and there is every reason to suppose that a continuous Christian life was maintained there.

But, further, there seems to be ample evidence in the Epistle that the recipients were a community of Christian Jews who were being sorely tried by the opposition of non-Christian Judaism, and who were in great danger of surrendering their faith and of returning to Judaism and the Synagogue. Now in Cyprus we have, at any rate, all the possibilities for such a state of things. The copper mines of the island probably attracted a considerable Jewish population, and the reference to 'the synagogues of the Jews' in Ac 13⁵ seems to bear out this supposition. In the reign of Hadrian the Jews are said to have massacred 240,000 of the Greek inhabitants, and to have gained temporary possession of the island. It is highly probable that in an island,—perhaps cut off somewhat from the main stream of Christian life, untouched, so far as we know, after the first missionary journey, by Paul's magnetic personality,—Jewish Christians would stand in the greatest peril of being reabsorbed in the Judaism which surrounded them.

Again, the position of Barnabas would be one of unquestionable pre-eminence among the churches of Cyprus. If it is *possible* that he could have used the stern and reproachful words of 5¹¹⁻¹⁴ to the Church of Jerusalem, it is *certain* that he could have used them to those of Cyprus. It is in this connexion too that ἀποκατασταθῶ in 13¹⁹ becomes very significant. The word most appropriately indicates the restoration of the writer, not only to his home, but to a home circle in which he was an important member.

The somewhat obscure allusion of 6¹⁰ may find

a possible solution on this theory. The words are: 'God is not unrighteous to forget your work and the love which ye showed toward His name, in that ye ministered unto the saints, and still do minister.' We know that men of Cyprus formed a distinct element in the Church of Antioch at the time when that Church sent provision for the poor saints at Jerusalem (Ac 11^{20, 30}) by the hands of Barnabas and Saul. May not the aorist διακονήσαντες in He 6¹⁰ refer to that particular episode, and the present διακονοῦντες to the fact that the Christians of Cyprus still continued their generous contributions?

One more difficult allusion *may* possibly receive light from this theory. If it be probable that Barnabas wrote the Epistle from Italy, where he had witnessed and survived the Neronian persecution, may not the words of 12⁴, 'Ye have not yet resisted unto blood,' be a touching reference to this? May it not be a hint that although the Christian communities of Cyprus were bearing their own share of adversity, they were not enduring such an agony of torture as their fellow-Christians in Rome?

Finally, we may say that the Christianity of Cyprus would be likely to have a strongly Jewish cast, and that the method of Christian worship would closely resemble that of the synagogue. It is therefore worth observing that the author in 13²² describes his Epistle as a λόγος παρακλήσεως. The same term is used in Ac 13¹⁵ of Paul's address to the synagogue at Antioch in Pisidia. May it not be that the author spoke of his address as a λόγος παρακλήσεως, which in an ordinary way he would have given by word of mouth to the Christian συναγωγῇ, but which he was forced through his absence to send in the form of an Epistle?

Several commentators have called attention to the possible connexion between the name of Barnabas υἱὸς παρακλήσεως (Ac 4³⁶) and this description of the Epistle as λόγος παρακλήσεως; as though the full meaning of the verse were: 'Endure such exhortation from one who is but true to his own name in giving it.' On this view of the destination, I think the coincidence has an added significance.

The resulting hypothesis may be briefly stated thus. Barnabas was in Italy during the Neronian persecution; he escaped with his life, but *may* have had to lie concealed somewhere in Italy. Timothy had been imprisoned, but was now set at liberty. Barnabas had waited in Italy for this release, in order that he and Timothy might return to the East together. While so waiting—possibly at Brundisium—he had word of the adversities and consequent depression of soul of his Christian converts in Cyprus. They were in danger of yielding to their environment and relapsing into

Judaism. To them, therefore, he sent this 'word of exhortation.'

It is just possible that this suggestion about the destination of the Epistle may have been made elsewhere. I have not, however, been able to discover it in any works on the Epistle to which I have had access. As it has occurred to me quite independently I have ventured to state it here, simply as an hypothesis with a claim for consideration.

Durham.

DAWSON WALKER.

The Descent into Hell.

IN the September number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES Mr. Burn criticizes my article which appeared under the above heading in the July number. I should like, however, to note one point in which a misunderstanding appears. It was not intended to question that Christ after death passed to the place where were the patriarchs and saints; the dubious point is, was this place heaven or the under-world of Hades? Mr. Burn says: 'the word *buried* had implied the teaching that Christ after death shared the condition of departed souls in the unseen world, which was commonly described as the under-world in antithesis to the upper-world of Heaven. What did Christ do in the under-world?'

This assumes the whole conclusion that the departed souls were in the under-world, not in Heaven, the very point which requires proof and which cannot be taken as an axiom.

The doxology of the Syriac *Didascalia* speaks in general terms of Christ passing where were the patriarchs; nothing whatever is said as to whether this was Heaven or Hades. The passage quoted from Ignatius to the Philadelphians (5) merely says: καὶ τοὺς προφῆτας δὲ ἀγαπῶμεν, διὰ τὸ καὶ αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον κατηγγελκέναι καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν ἐλπίζειν καὶ αὐτὸν ἀναμένειν. Ignatius to the Magn. (9) says: παρὼν ἡγείρεν αὐτοὺς ἐκ νεκρῶν. If it be assumed as an axiom that when Christ raised the dead He must have done so in the under-world, and that the Patriarchs who waited for Christ did so in the under-world, these passages could be made to refer to the under-world: without such a preliminary assumption there is no necessary reference.

The quotation from Cyril is of a different nature. Here is an unquestionable mention of Hades: the only danger is that it is too clear, as it seems to show acquaintance with the whole legend which forms the basis of the Gospel of Nicodemus. The Creed of Sirmium, as Mr. Burn admits, is not free from the suspicion of Western influence.

My quotation 'regnum' from the *Te Deum* was an error, which I regret.

It is not easy to understand how the life of the Italian, Gallic, and kindred Churches can be fairly described as a 'backwater': the legend (if the word be permitted) of Nicodemus flourished throughout these Churches.

DE LACY O'LEARY.

Bristol.

A Closing Word on Psalm cxlix. 5.

I READ with much interest Dr. König's second note on the above passage (in the August number), and in common, I am sure, with most of the readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, I feel grateful to him for the solution he proposes afresh. I may be allowed, however, a closing word to explain why I am unable to accept it as the best, or even as a tenable solution.

No one who is acquainted with the subject needs to be told that the number of 'rises' in Hebrew poems does not conform to rules of mathematical exactness. But when a Psalm exhibits so regular a structure as the one before us, it is surely permissible, or even imperative, to treat with suspicion a single deviation from that regularity. There may, indeed, be differences of opinion as to the number of 'rises' here present, but of course this is not the place to discuss the grounds or the correctness of these opinions. The principal reason why I cannot regard the proposal to read יָהּ כְּבוֹד as satisfactory, is that יָהּ is itself a form that has been much disputed of late, and hence one would rather not introduce it where it does not stand. But, in addition to this, Dr. König has done nothing to weaken the force of my objections to the second verse-half, namely, that the word מִשְׁכַּבְתִּים and the whole sense of this verse-half appear to me out of place in this context.

No arguments have been brought *against* my proposal of such convincing power as to make it appear untenable. In any case, unfortunately, the time has not yet come when exegetes can claim in regard to Ps 149⁵ to have removed another *crux interpretum*.

JULIUS BOEHMER.

Raben bei Wiesenburg (Mark).

A CORRECTION. — The Dean of Westminster's recent book, *Some Thoughts on the Incarnation*, is published by Messrs. Longman, not by Messrs. Macmillan. We regret the trouble caused to Messrs. Macmillan by having to answer inquiries for the book.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, St. Cyrus, Montrose.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE Extra Volume of the *Dictionary of the Bible* will contain four new maps. Two will illustrate Professor Buhl's article on ROADS AND TRAVEL IN THE OLD TESTAMENT; and two will illustrate Professor Ramsay's article on ROADS AND TRAVEL IN NEW TESTAMENT TIMES. The authors of the articles have themselves superintended the preparation of the maps. Each of them will occupy two pages of the *Dictionary*.

The Map which illustrates the Roads connecting Palestine with the neighbouring countries will cover the whole of what is known as the Ancient East. The places where explorations have been carried on will be marked upon it. Professor Ramsay's map of Asia Minor will correct some errors that are retained in even the latest and best maps. Such errors are not due always to carelessness or ignorance, but sometimes to a subsequent rearrangement of boundaries, or even a shifting of the land or water. It will be necessary also for students of St. Paul to examine Professor Ramsay's map of the Apostle's Travels.

Mr. Claude G. Montefiore, joint-editor with Mr. Abrahams of the *Jewish Quarterly Review*, has published a volume on *Liberal Judaism* (Macmillan; 3s. net). Mr. Montefiore is a believer in Evolution and an adherent of the Higher Criticism. It

is not easy for a man to be all that and a Jew. The purpose of Mr. Montefiore's book is to show what Liberal Judaism is; but more, to show that a man may advocate Liberal Judaism and still be a Jew.

For it is freely stated that there is Judaism and Liberal Judaism, and that these two are not one. Mr. Montefiore rejects the separation. He admits that there is Orthodox Judaism and Liberal Judaism, and he holds that both are Judaism. But if a majority-vote or the casting of lots should decide that only Orthodox Judaism is Judaism, then Mr. Montefiore is resolved to be cast forth with Liberal Judaism. Like Luther (and the likeness is so close as to startle one) he says, God help him, he can do no other.

We do not wonder that the Orthodox Jews say that Liberal Judaism is not Judaism. It does not believe in the Inspiration of Scripture. Mr. Montefiore says it does. But the Orthodox Jew denies that Mr. Montefiore's inspiration is inspiration. For he says that it takes place according to law, and that it varies in clearness and power. It takes place according to law. That rules out the supernatural. It rules out physical miracle and prophetic prediction. And it varies in clearness and power. That means that Isaiah was perhaps more inspired than Amos, but perhaps less than Dante;

and it means that there are things in Isaiah which may be neither new nor true.

For inspiration, according to Mr. Montefiore, is not the inspiration of the Bible. It is communion with God. The man who holds the communion has the inspiration, and the measure of the inspiration is the degree of the communion. So Mr. Montefiore agrees with Orthodox Judaism in holding that the New Testament is uninspired. But he contradicts it in saying that the Old Testament is also uninspired. And then he goes so far as to say that Jesus of Nazareth may have been inspired. And how can he be a Jew after that?

If he can, there is worse to follow. Mr. Montefiore does not believe in the dietary laws of the Old Testament. He holds that he is at liberty to eat a rabbit or a hare. He passionately pleads that he is a Jew still, but he knows how passionately it will be resisted. For according to Orthodox Judaism the man who eats a rabbit or a hare is less a Jew than the man who commits adultery. If he breaks any of the moral precepts of the Law of Moses, regard must be had to the weakness of the flesh. He yielded to the temptation, but he regrets it and repents of his sin. He is not a good Jew, but he is a Jew. But the man who eats a rabbit or a hare does so either because he does not *want* to remain a Jew, or else because he does not believe that these prohibitions are from God. In either case, says Orthodox Judaism, he is no longer a Jew.

Soon after the issue of Mr. Montefiore's book on 'Liberal Judaism,' there was published an English translation of Professor Jean Réville's lectures on *Liberal Christianity* (Williams & Norgate; 4s.).

The similarity between the two books is remarkable. Professor Réville departs from Orthodox Christianity as radically as Mr. Montefiore departs from Orthodox Judaism. In both cases the departure is due to the acceptance of Evolution and

the Higher Criticism. In both the departure ends with the rejection of all that interferes with the reign of natural law and the judgment seat of the man's own reason. Inspiration is in both personal communion with God; Dante and Milton are inspired along with Isaiah and Jesus of Nazareth. There is no Messianic prediction and no resurrection from the dead.

But Professor Réville is far more ready than Mr. Montefiore to acknowledge his dissent from Orthodoxy. He delights in describing the antagonism between Liberal and Orthodox Christianity. He declares that Liberal Protestantism (for he prefers that word to Christianity, though he says that it means the same thing) is not Protestant Liberalism. An orthodox person may practise a little liberalism, but that will not make him a Liberal Protestant. The title has a definite use. It is reserved for those—French-speaking Protestants they all are as yet—who reject the doctrines that mar traditional Protestantism and retain the spirit that made both Protestantism and Christianity.

They are the 'well-instructed persons' of the following paragraph: 'The dogma of original sin and of the fundamental corruption of the human race is indissolubly bound up with a conception of history which no well-instructed person in our day can possibly hold. The splendid narratives of the Creation and the Fall in Genesis can appear to us now nothing more than legends of a very high religious inspiration, but absolutely devoid of historical or scientific authority. And the experience of humanity proves that the notion of the fundamental corruption of man and of his total inability to do the right, except in the Christian community, is contradicted by countless observations.'

Yet Professor Réville is as anxious to prove that he is a Protestant still as Mr. Montefiore is anxious to prove that he is still a Jew. He holds none of the dogmas of traditional Christianity, yet he is the only true Christian. For Christianity consists

in a single and simple law of life : 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and thy neighbour as thyself.' Professor Réville likes to put it into the form of 'love to the God in man and the man in God.' And he holds that the true Christian or Protestant is he who adapts that law to the circumstances of his day and obeys it. If there is any tradition it is false. It is false because it is tradition. Orthodox Christianity boasts of its traditional inheritance from the past. Professor Jean Réville says that in so far as it is a tradition it is not Christianity.

'If we are not to say that the Atonement (as a work carried through in the sufferings and death of Christ, sufferings and death determined by our sin) is vicarious or substitutionary, what are we to call it?'

The question is asked by Dr. Denney in the book he has published on *The Atonement and the Modern Mind* (Hodder & Stoughton; 2s. 6d.). He knows the answer. He has prepared the way for it. In the next paragraph it comes. 'The only answer which has been given to this question, by those who continue to speak of Atonement at all, is that we must conceive Christ not as the substitute, but as the representative of sinners.'

Dr. Denney does not deny that this word 'Representative' has some advantages. It recognizes a relationship between the sinner and his Saviour. It insists upon that relationship as necessary to the salvation. It shows that the salvation wrought by Christ is not an accomplished fact, done for the sinner as it might be done for a fallen angel, and finished off whether the sinner appropriates it or not. It recognizes the co-operation that there must be between the sinner and his Saviour, first in kinship and then in will. But he holds that if there is objection to 'Substitute' the objection to 'Representative' is quite as strong.

Dr. Denney is thinking of a criticism of his book

on the *Death of Christ*, which appeared in the *Primitive Methodist Quarterly*. It was written by Professor Peake. He is preparing to answer that criticism. Professor Peake claimed for 'Representative' not only that it was the better, but that it was the only word to express the relationship of Christ to men. He said: 'If we place ourselves at Paul's point of view, we shall see that to the eye of God the death of Christ presents itself less as an act which Christ does for the race than as an act which the race does in Christ.'

Dr. Denney turns that into 'plain English.' 'In plain English,' he says, 'Paul teaches less that Christ died for the ungodly, than that the ungodly in Christ died for themselves.' And then he adds that this is presented as something profound, a recognition of the mystical depths in Paul's teaching. But 'I own I can see nothing profound in it except a profound misapprehension of the apostle.'

Nevertheless Dr. Denney welcomes the word and Professor Peake's explanation of it. He welcomes the explanation because it shows him what the word logically leads to when it is opposed to substitute. It recognizes a 'racial act' in the death of Christ. Christ is ours in the article of His death, and we are one with Him. Dr. Denney replies that Christ is not ours. This very apostle's point of view is, he says, that we are 'without Christ' (*χωρὶς Χριστοῦ*). He is not put forward by us, as Dr. Denney claims that a representative must be. He is sent by God, and that is not to make Him a Representative but just a Substitute. It is what Christ does for us, not the effect which that produces in us, still less 'the fantastic abstraction of a racial act,' that is the Atonement of the New Testament.

It is a very rough and ready way of handling prophecy to deny the element of prediction in it. The suspicion arises that the denial is due not to the study of prophecy, but to a little knowledge of Darwinism. It is to look at prophecy after one has

come to the conclusion that God first willed to express His will in law and then allowed the law to crush the freedom of His will. Professor Driver does not deny a predictive element in prophecy. The late Professor Davidson did not deny it.

Professor Davidson knew well that the old definition of prophecy, Prophecy = Prediction, was so partial as to be untrue. But he saw that the Hebrew prophet believed himself able to predict the future. He saw that without the power of prediction he was so much the less a prophet. For if the prophet speaks for God, it would be strange if he should be able to refer only to the present and the past. It is true that we do not need to know isolated occurrences in the future, that we should be none the better saints if the day of our death were revealed to us. But God is a God of connexion. Few things do occur in isolation. And the prophet who could not see with the inner eye the issue of events that were taking place in his time and predict that issue with assurance, was scarcely worth the name of prophet.

Professor Davidson went further than that. In his volume on *Old Testament Prophecy*, now issued by Messrs. T. & T. Clark under the editorship of Professor Paterson (10s. 6d. net), he says that we are entitled to look for the direct fulfilment of prophecy, and not of the main ideas of the prophet only, but 'perhaps also some, or even much, of the formal details.'

He has no doubt whatever of the main ideas. How could he have any doubt? If Prophecy is reduced to the general statement, 'Be sure your sin will find you out,' with occasional contemporary application of it, the Hebrew prophet would have done little more for his nation than the Greek philosopher did for his. There is no doubt that he was a foreseer as well as a seer. There is no question there. The question is, Ought we to be content with the fulfilment of the general idea of the prophecy, or should we look for the fulfilment of the details?

Professor Davidson believed that sometimes, perhaps often, we should look for the fulfilment of the details. He is bold enough to say that it is more after the spirit of prophecy to hold that Zechariah predicted the actual entry of the Messiah into Jerusalem *riding on an ass*, than to say that he used the phrase merely to express how peaceful and lowly He would be.

Such a statement is not to be appreciated without some study of prophecy. And the best approach to the study of prophecy is Professor Davidson's own book. For, as he passes on, he opens up, in the very chapter with which we are dealing, wonderful avenues of insight into the prophetic mind. Was the Hebrew prophet a poet merely? Was he merely a poet when he sang of the day when the wolf should dwell with the lamb, and the little child should lead them? In the West a poet may say that and be a poet only. In the East we may doubt if a poet is ever a poet only. We may doubt if he would think it worth his while to be a poet, if he could not be a prophet also. The Hebrew prophet was a poet because he was a prophet. He sang of a redeemed earth because he could predict its redemption. He included the wolf in his picture because he had keen sympathy with all the creatures which his God had made, and yet more because he saw how it might come to pass that the creature also should be delivered from the bondage of its corruption and enter into the glorious liberty of the children of God.

There is a certain mystery about Saul's malady which has never yet been cleared up. The mystery makes the character and career of Saul more piquant. But it is possible that piquancy may be got at the cost of a great lesson. Was Saul guilty of some secret sin? Dr. Charles Creighton believes that he was. He believes that Saul's sin was indulgence in hachish.

Hachish is an intoxicant drug, the disreputable intoxicant drug of the East to-day, as opium is

the respectable narcotic. Its use can be traced to a great antiquity. In his *Chrestomathic Arabe*, De Sacy proves that it was in use among the Arabs as early as the sixth or seventh centuries of our era. And the probability is very great that it was known and indulged in at least as many centuries before Christ. For the fibre of that hemp plant (*Cannabis sativa*), from the flowers of which hachish is gathered as a resinous dew, was used for cordage in very early ages.

Mr. Charles Creighton, M.D., writes on 'Indications of the Hachish Vice in the Old Testament' in the French periodical, *Janus*, for the months of May and June. He acknowledges the difficulty of proving that Saul was addicted to this vice. It is scarcely possible to prove that any one was addicted to any secret vice in antiquity, so carefully are such things concealed under unsuspecting forms of words. But his suggestion seems to supply the key to certain obscurities of the narrative, and it certainly deserves the consideration of the student of Religion and the Old Testament.

Dr. Creighton begins with Jonathan. Or rather he begins with a passage in the Song of Solomon, and then passes on to the case of Saul and Jonathan. The passage is Canticles 5¹, 'I am come into my garden, my sister, my spouse; I have gathered my myrrh with my spice; *I have eaten my honey-comb with my honey*; I have drunk my wine with my milk.' The phrase to be noticed is the one he has thrown into italics. It is certainly suspicious. To eat the honey-comb along with the honey is unusual and not very pleasant. It suggests a minor poet at his wits' end to fill out a line.

But the Hebrew is 'I have eaten *my wood* (עֵץ) with my honey.' That invites investigation. The LXX did not know what to make of it, or purposely made something very proper and commonplace of it, for they render 'I have eaten *my bread* (ἄρτον μου) with my honey.' It was the Vulgate that hit upon the paraphrase of 'honey-

comb' (*favum*)—a bold licence, says Dr. Creighton, and a platitude to boot, for there is neither wit nor point in making one eat the honey-comb along with the honey. Dr. Creighton takes it that the word wood or thicket is used for the hemp plant; and if he had been producing the Vulgate translation he would have made it, *comedi cannabim cum confectione mellis*—which is the elegant way of taking hachish in the East to this day.

Now about Jonathan. The occasion is Jonathan's great victory over the Philistines (1 S 14). The words in point are: 'And all [they of] the land came to a wood; and there was honey upon the ground. And when the people were come into the wood, behold, the honey dropped; but no man put his hand to his mouth: for the people feared the oath. But Jonathan heard not when his father charged the people with the oath: wherefore he put forth the end of the rod that was in his hand, and dipped it in an honey-comb, and put his hand to his mouth; and his eyes were enlightened.'

The first thing to observe is that the words translated 'honey-comb' are literally 'honey wood' or 'honey thicket' (עֵץ הַדְּבַשׁ). It is again the Vulgate that has started exegesis in the wrong direction, says Dr. Creighton, by translating 'honey-thicket' as before by *favus*, 'honey-comb.' There is no mention of honey or honey bees. The word never means 'comb,' but wood or forest of some dense growing plant. The statement, says Dr. Creighton, is that they came to a field of hemp and found its resinous exudation dropping from the flower-stalks with the heat.

And what did Jonathan do? Dr. W. B. O'Shaughnessy, in his *Bengal Dispensatory* (1842), says that in Central India and the Sangor territory, men clad in leather rush through the hemp fields in the hot season; the soft resin adheres to the leather, from which it is afterwards scraped and kneaded into balls. In Nipal, he adds, the leathern dress is dispensed with, and the resin is

gathered on the skins of naked coolies. Jonathan's method was simpler. He touched the hot flowers with the end of his stick and carried it to his mouth. The mere taste of this 'honey' is said to have 'enlightened his eyes.'

So, for the moment at least, Jonathan was a hachish-eater. Dr. Creighton believes that he was so habitually, and his father with him. He thinks there is evidence to show that hachish-eating was a vice of the royal palace, and that this was the very reason why Saul said, 'Cursed be the man that eateth any food until evening, that I may be avenged on mine enemies.' It was not the question of urgency merely. It was the fear of the 'enlightening.'

For if the hachish 'enlightens' the eyes for a moment, it dulls the senses, unnerves the heart, and destroys the reason, in the end. This is the explanation, thinks Dr. Creighton, of Saul's terror on the eve of the battle of Gilboa. This is the meaning of the madness that he was subject to at intervals. And this is the reason why the kingdom was taken from him and given to another.

Dr. Creighton thinks that the hachish merchants were the Amalekites, and that that explains Samuel's hatred of Agag and all his race. Those 'sinners' the Amalekites—it was fitting that Saul the hachish-eater should be sent to destroy them. It was a last great opportunity given to him to recover himself and crush the hated merchants of his vice. But he could not do it. He spared Agag. And if we sympathize with his weakness, and wonder at the wrath of the prophet, who rose and slew Agag the Amalekite with his own hand, it is well, Dr. Creighton thinks, that we should consider the mischief that Agag had done to Saul and to his kingdom.

As for Saul's madness. One thing is clear, that music has no power over ordinary madness or any form of melancholy. The example of David playing before Saul has introduced the harp into a

lunatic asylum occasionally, but it has had no effect. There is one sort of mental aberration, however, which music touches. It is the insanity of the hachish-eater. In the year 1845 Dr. J. Moreau published his valuable work, *Du Hachish et de l'Aliénation Mentale*, in which he describes 'la puissante influence qu'exerce la musique sur ceux qui ont pris du hachish.' Music, he says, even the roughest, the mere vibrations of the strings of a harp or guitar, excite one to something like delirium, or plunge one into a great melancholy.

Dr. Moreau does not refer to Saul's madness. It had not occurred to him to look for an example in the Old Testament. It is the more surprising that he so closely describes the case of Saul. And Dr. Creighton adds that nothing is more characteristic of hachish-eating than ungovernable fits of temper—such fits as Saul had when he threw his javelin at David to strike him to the wall.

Mr. R. Somervell, M.A., late scholar of King's College, Cambridge, has published a small volume, through Mr. Elliot Stock, which he calls '*Eternal Life, its Nature and Sustenance; a Reflection*' (2s. 6d.). The book is little, and it is not all his own. Nearly one-half of it is a summary of McLeod Campbell's '*Christ the Bread of Life*.' And yet, if Mr. Somervell is right in what he says, this little book of his is worth the greatest of the month's publications.

He says that Christ's offer to men is Life. It is not forgiveness of sins, though that is promised; nor holiness, though that is demanded. It is Life. 'I come that they may have life.' 'I give unto them eternal life.' 'I am the way and the truth and the life.' 'Even as thou gavest him authority over all flesh, that whatsoever thou hast given him, to them he should give eternal life.'

It is true that these sayings are all quoted from the Fourth Gospel. They are none the worse

for that. And although they cannot be directly paralleled from the Synoptics, it is clear to Mr. Somervell that 'eternal life' was in the Synoptic teaching Christ's ordinary offer. How otherwise would the lawyer in St. Luke (10²⁵) and the ruler in St. Matthew (19¹⁶) and St. Mark (10¹⁷) come and ask how they might inherit 'eternal life'?

And St. Paul is in agreement. 'The free gift of God is eternal life in Christ Jesus our Lord.' It is the only complete expression of the gift of Christ. It includes the revelation of the Father, forgiveness, peace, holiness. As Hort says, 'This is the one character of the gospel that takes precedence of all others; its many partial messages are unfoldings of its primary message of life.'

But why life? What is life that it should be the sum and substance of all that Christ came to give us? It is a metaphor of course. It is an application to the spirit of that which we know in physical organisms, the opposite of which we call death. Already it is metaphorically used of the intellect, when we speak of certain powers of thinking, reasoning, judging as indications of intellectual life. What is life when transferred to the region of the spirit?

It is something that has to be sustained with food. So has the natural life. And as the word for the natural life is chosen for it, so also the words for the sustenance of the natural life are chosen to express its sustenance: 'I am the bread of life; he that cometh to me shall never hunger, and he that believeth on me shall never thirst.' And then, when the Jews were perplexed and murmured, with greater emphasis and greater perplexity, He said, 'Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in yourselves.'

Will He condescend to tell us what those words mean? Only if we have ears to hear. In another place He says, 'As the living Father hath sent me,

and I live by the Father, even so he that eateth me, he also shall live by me.' So He lives by the Father. He eats the Father. He eats the flesh and drinks the blood of the Father. How does He do that? 'My meat is to do the will of him that sent me, and to accomplish his work.'

It was on the occasion of His journey to Galilee. He must needs go through Samaria. When He came to Jacob's Well He sat down upon it and sent the disciples into the town to buy food. It was food for the body they went to buy; but when they came back they found that He had forgotten the needs of the body. They invited Him to eat. 'I have meat to eat that ye know not of.' He had been doing the Father's will, and so He had been feeding on the Father. It was a solitary and a sinful woman. But it is not the will of the Father that one of these little ones should perish. He had had a full meal and was not hungry.

Well, if Christ's meat was to do the will of the Father, our meat is to do the will of the Son. If when Christ did the Father's will He lived by the Father; when we do the will of the Son we live by the Son. And to eat His flesh and drink His blood is just to do His will.

Thus far it is simple and unmistakable. But a difficulty is at hand. It is not in the very next step. For the next step is this. That if feeding upon Christ is doing His will, then eternal life is the absence of the will of self and the acceptance of the will of Christ. He that believeth, that is, feedeth, on Him, hath eternal life. The difficulty is not there.

The difficulty faces us when we come to those words about feeding upon Christ which are most of all familiar to us. 'This is my body; this is my blood; this do in remembrance of me.' There are three ways of understanding these words.

One way is to take them literally. That is to

say, some understand that the bread represents the flesh of the Son of Man and the wine His blood; and to eat the bread and drink the wine is somehow to eat His flesh and drink His blood. To some it is a very literal act, to others it is less so. But to all of this way of thinking it is necessary to eat the bread and to drink the wine in order that they may have life in themselves.

Another way is to pass the words, 'This is my body,' and 'This is my blood,' and rest upon the words, 'This do in remembrance of me.' Then the Holy Communion is simply a memorial supper. It is not a memorial of the Last Supper merely; it is a memorial of the life that was given 'a ransom for many.' It is a memorial however. The bread and the wine are shared because He said, 'This do in remembrance of me.'

Mr. Somervell does not believe that either of those ways is the right way. There is a third. He does not believe that the Supper is a mere memorial, because nowhere does Christ lay emphasis upon memorials. Everywhere He emphasizes a present Christ. His own meat is to do the will of the Father; our meat is to do His will—it is never to remember His death or dying love. Nor does he believe that the eating of the bread and the drinking of the wine are the necessary conditions for receiving the gift of life and sustaining it. If it were necessary to receive the consecrated elements in order to have life in us, then our mode of nourishment would be different from His own. 'I live by the Father'—and that, He explained, means, 'I do the will of the Father'; 'even so ye live by me'—not by receiving bread and wine, but by doing My will.

It was on that last night in which he was betrayed that He instituted the Supper. He did not introduce a new mode of nourishing the spiritual life. He had already explained that when He spoke of eating His flesh and drinking His blood, He meant identification of will, surrender

of the human will and glad acceptance of the divine will. How could He unsay all that? How could He introduce disorder now? How could He say that after all it was no metaphor He had been employing, but that in deed and in truth it was necessary for man to eat His flesh and drink His blood?

Mr. Somervell meets objections. The objection will be made that then the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is only a symbol. If the eating of the bread and the drinking of the wine are nothing in themselves, if they merely signify the doing of the will of God, then the importance attached to the ordinance in the New Testament and in the Church is out of all proportion to its real value. Mr. Somervell replies, 'Only a symbol?' What are the regiment's colours but a symbol? Yet when the soldier has given his life to rescue them from the enemy, we have never felt that his life was given for nothing.

The objection will also be made that it is possible to receive Mr. Somervell's view and hold the other also. Is it not possible to believe that the elements are symbols and also instruments; that they figure the doing of the will of our Lord, and yet are the means by which it is done? Mr. Somervell does not think that it is possible. In the history of the Church he sees the impossibility. First, there was the spiritual conception wherein the elements were symbols of that eating of the flesh and drinking of the blood of the Son of man, which signified the daily doing of His will. Then came the conception that the eating and drinking were ends in themselves. The Fathers sometimes tried to hold both views together. Slowly the material view gained the day, till transubstantiation became a dogma and test of Catholic orthodoxy. They cannot be held together. In time the presence of Christ in the heart will be beaten by the presence of Christ upon the altar.

The deeper objection will be made that the

belief in the real presence has actually been the occasion of spiritual blessing. Against that objection Mr. Somervell has nothing to urge. He is most loyal to the Church, most reverent to the administration of grace. Why should the Communion not be a means of grace? It is at least an act of obedience to the command: 'This do in remembrance of Me'; and every act of

obedience brings a blessing. 'But,' he says, 'the grace given is one thing, and our theories as to the nature of the giving and receiving are another; and we must be on our guard against supposing that the reality and value of a spiritual gift are dependent upon the accuracy of what is really only an intellectual conception of the way in which it is given.'

Theodor Mommsen.

FUNERAL ORATION BY PROFESSOR A. HARNACK, D.D., PH.D., BERLIN.¹

The peace of God be with us all!

LORD, Thou hast been our dwelling-place in all generations. Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever Thou hadst formed the earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting, Thou art God. Thou turnest man to destruction; and sayest, Return, ye children of men. For a thousand years in Thy sight are but as yesterday when it is past, and as a watch in the night. The days of our years are threescore years and ten, or even by reason of strength fourscore years; yet is their pride but labour and sorrow; for it is soon cut off, and we fly away. Amen.

DEVOUT MOURNERS,—In deep grief and with hearts full of pain, we have gathered round the bier of Theodor Mommsen. Quenched is the light of that eye in which the world and its history were so clearly mirrored; the spirit which arranged and controlled its visions has returned to its Creator.

Neither disease nor weakness, neither trouble nor care nor grief could check the revolution of the brazen spokes of the wheel of that life which is now ended. The wheel stopped only when the limit appointed to human life was reached, only when the work given him to do was ended.

Our grief for his loss is of the profoundest. Our sorrow is shared by this whole city, whose burgess-roll included his name, and by the University and the Academy, whose pride and joy he was. It is shared by our King and our Fatherland, nay, by the whole outside world which can recognize and

appreciate genius; above all, by Italy and by that city, the eternal Rome, to whose history the labour of his life was devoted.

All these have lost him. High and low, old and young, know that a star has grown pale and a crown fallen. They mourn, but they do not repine, for his course was finished, and even with those near to him, those to whom he was husband, father, friend, repining should be swallowed up in gratitude to God, who gave them such a possession, and gave it so long.

Not on his account do we lament, but on our own; for in Theodor Mommsen there has been taken from us not only the acknowledged master, but a part of our own life and history. We have been rendered poorer, and who can make up this loss to us?

Thanks to him we had been brought into living contact with the days of our fathers, with glorious days in our history, both external and internal, with lofty, commanding spirits. But it was not only as a messenger but as a witness of these times that he stood in our midst, leading himself a life such as none of us can live after him, none of us fully appreciate. How we shall miss him!

But at the present moment it becomes us to control our natural feelings, the feelings of the heart, and to pay the last honour to the mighty dead by calling up as vivid a picture as we can of his character and his work. We move this picture into the light of the Eternal, the light of the Lord of history, as we inscribe upon it the Scripture saying: 'I have chosen you and appointed you that ye should go and bring forth fruit, and that your fruit should abide.'

¹ The Oration here translated was pronounced by Professor Harnack at the funeral service of Professor Mommsen in the Kaiser Wilhelm Memorial Church, Berlin, on 5th November 1903. The original has since been published by Hinrichs, Leipzig (price 50 pfennigs).

'That ye go and bring forth fruit.' Where has this saying ever been more abundantly fulfilled? For sixty years continuously this tree went on bearing fruit. The law of summer and winter seemed not to exist for it. It was like those trees of the south, on which one sees the ripe fruit side by side with the blossom. And all that Theodor Mommsen gave us bears from first to last the stamp of one and the same genius, or, better, of an immense power of will, coupled with a burning spirit that would not let him rest.

Licht wird Alles was ich fasse,
Kohle Alles was ich lasse,
Flamme bin ich sicherlich.

And yet his was a constructive, positive spirit. Those knew him ill who judged him simply by the vigour and thoroughness with which, axe in hand, he cut away briars and undergrowth, and cleared a path for himself. And those, too, misunderstood his genius who found his whole character expressed in the sharp criticism, the grim irony and sarcasm of which he could avail himself so readily. All these were simply the weapons, ever ready, with which his nature, doubly reacting at every impression, warded off what was alien to it, and smote down untruth and opposition. But behind this there was a great, firm, and at the same time emotional will, which was directed towards the positive knowledge of things.

We have had no historian who put forth such exertions and showed such power to compel the great and the little in history to account for themselves, who drew sparks even from the unheeded and hardest flint, and who ceased not nor rested until the whole was rounded off into a fixed body of observations and knowledge.

What was the secret of his scientific uniqueness? This, namely, that the tasks and duties of the historian which in other cases are usually assigned to a number of hands, nay, which seem to be mutually exclusive, were all taken in hand by him, and that all at once, and executed with the skill of a master.

In this universal activity he has had, in the full sense, no predecessor, and has furnished us with an ideal, but an unattainable one. For, in the first place, he showed an heroic diligence in tracing, collecting, and carefully sifting his material. Not only did he immensely increase the latter, he even added wholly new departments to it. Wherever he imagined that there was anything to be dis-

covered bearing upon his great subject, he forced his way, breaking down hedges and bars till he conquered the land.

Drudgery¹ this may be called, but those who speak thus do not know this work. True, much must here be done in the midst of dust; and there will be required much patience and self-denial, and still more sharpness, still more caution and sobriety, as well as an unfailing sense of the truth, and a bridled imagination. But where these virtues are present, drudgery of this kind is royal work; and such Mommsen made it. It was the love of his youth, this strenuous work, and he remained true to it to the last. Nay, when in his old age he was no longer himself capable of the highest tasks, he was all the more diligent in that kind of work as if he himself must hew every stone for building. Half-work he never did and never tolerated. 'His sleepless nights have brightened our day.'

But all this was only preliminary work. Eleven years after the young Doctor of Jurisprudence had issued his first publication, after he had been in Italy and had there begun his great work on inscriptions, after he had in the course of three years composed ninety treatises—appeared his *Römische Geschichte*. All at once we Germans had a historical work given to us such as we had never possessed before. The same man, who could not be too painfully exact, had produced a work which is wholly the product of creative observation, a history constructed from the sources, born anew in the spirit of its creator, full of colour and life, because everywhere lived over again, nay, lived contemporaneously with the events. The calm descriptions of Ranke had now a counterpiece in this sparkling *History*, with its emotional conceptions and emotional judgments. The only two possible methods of historical description—Ranke's, which introduces us to the material, and Mommsen's, which introduces the material to us—had now presented their masterpieces to the nation. The influence of this upon our writing of history and upon our culture during the last fifty years, who can estimate? What Niebuhr began, had reached a glorious development.

All that had its being in Theodor Mommsen, besides the historian, co-operated in this work—the philologist, the jurist, the politician, and, not least, the poet. Here our artist had seized a great

¹ *Kürrner-Arbeit*, lit. 'carters' work.'

subject, and given to it proportion and order, movement and beauty. This *History* is a classical, and therefore an enduring work, because it bears the stamp of the artist, and because its author has kept back nothing of his inmost being. An artist, a poet he was and remained till old age. Hence he never lost his youth. Exact science and poetic genius and grace formed here the rarest alliance, and it may well be said that this alliance was the most unique feature of his personality.

Quite a number of other able and comprehensive works we owe to Theodor Mommsen, among them that great scientific work, *Das Römische Staatsrecht*. For boldness of combination and organizing faculty, these perhaps surpass the *History*, but the materials gave less scope to the artist. But in particular instances, what intuition here, too, what inimitable power and grace!

From the constructive scholar we turn our glance to the teacher. Every one who to-day studies or teaches Ancient History, is his pupil. Nothing needs to be said on that point. But on the question how he taught, our best witnesses are those who sat at his feet. Thus writes one in the name of all: 'Of what we gained, not only in knowledge and method, but in character and reverence for truth and truthfulness, we, surviving pupils of Mommsen, will retain in our hearts a grateful recollection to our latest breath.'

But in yet another sense Theodor Mommsen was a teacher. When he began his career, in the department of Mental Philosophy there had been scarcely a commencement made in the direction of united labour, and towards such undertakings as are too great for individual effort. He became the organizer of the great scientific works carried on in our Fatherland, receiving the needful support from the Prussian Education Department, which met his proposals in the most unquestioning spirit. Thanks to its aid, he raised the work of the *Akademie der Wissenschaften* to quite a new level, showing himself its most active and influential member since Leibniz and the brothers Humboldt, whom he further resembled in bringing the different sciences together, and arranging mutual exchanges between them, and in forming a bond between the scholars of Europe, nay, even those outside it. His experience, his counsel, his energy, his time, which he never grudged, were placed at the disposal of every important undertaking.

It was not otherwise at the University. For

decades past no question of importance emerged there, on which his advice was not sought above all. And there was no change in this respect after he ceased to lecture. He was still in our midst, and the more knotty the problem the more surely could one count upon him. For a long time past he has been unquestionably the leader of the University, not only on account of the lustre of his name, but on account of the services he rendered it. For himself he never desired anything; but he spared no pains for others and for the cause. And what a speaking, preaching model was this indefatigable white-haired worker to every colleague! 'I have appointed you that ye should go and bring forth fruit, and that your fruit should abide.' Truly he has accomplished that for which he was called. We lay upon his coffin a wreath of unfading gratitude.

The University is a close corporation, but it is connected with public life, and the place Theodor Mommsen took in the latter was a very prominent one. But here he was involved also in bitter conflicts, and the saying, 'Many foes much honour,' was fulfilled in him. In order to understand his conduct in these conflicts, in which he spent his heart's blood, one must not forget that his was essentially a world-retired, scholarly nature, which knew *things* better than *men*, but that ever and anon, as it were by fits and starts, he felt it to be the most sacred duty to serve his Fatherland in public affairs as well, to counsel and to warn it, and to take part in its development. This imperative consciousness lived in him from the days of his youth, from the struggle for freedom of his Schleswig native land.

He was guided in all this by firm convictions that could not be shaken: the conviction of the blessing of the monarchy, the conviction that freedom is the surest foundation for the continued existence and advance of a nation, and the conviction that citizens themselves must put their hand to the matter and educate themselves to freedom if things are to be better. And what he preached to his own country he wished to see realized also in the relations of nations to one another. And so he looked forward to peaceful fellowship, to a union of nations upon the basis of progressing morals and culture—at once a patriot and a citizen of the world, to whom his native land was above confession, party and race, but whose heart and mind embraced humanity.

How many noble words he spoke also in this sphere! How he roused and awakened men! How he sought to educate the citizens of the future! But his emotional nature too often mistook the proper means, and his words failed of impression when they came in contact with hard actualities. How much pain this gave him was known only to his intimate friends. But there was a sorrow deeper still—the unrest and the pain of genius which chafes at the contrast between the ideal and the actual, and which is burdened by the contrasts within its own nature. On the one side a hot emotional temperament, which disregards every nuance, and can see only bright light or deep shadow; on the other side an incomparable, calm intellect, disciplined by strict self-control. Here the flame of impatience and youthful impetuosity, there a steady and ever-creating power, overcoming every difficulty with wisdom and patience. Here the bitter word and harshly expressed judgment, there the deepest craving for peace, coupled with warm-hearted and broad-minded toleration for everything human.

I venture to say that the better one came to know him, the more prominently appeared the noblest traits of this great, rich nature; and even much of what still appears to us sour fruit is destined one day to ripen and refresh. There was in his inmost soul the most refined sense of the truth, a hatred of everything hollow and impure, and a craving for love and friendship, deeper, tenderer, and stronger than I have ever met with. Those who came under the influence of this warm sun, know the strength and the tenderness of his friendship. It was only here that this most living

genius was wholly itself. This communion of heart with heart and mouth with mouth was the element of his life. The loyalty of his friendship was what was noblest in him. The harvest he reaped was love and undying gratitude. And—let me speak the last secret—he never had lofty notions of himself. His tasks stood far higher than anything personal; he never did himself justice, he never felt as if he had brought forth real fruits. But this very disposition is a fulfilment of the saying, ‘I have appointed you, that ye should go and bring forth fruit, and that your fruit should abide.’

The last weeks and days came. He still worked without repose, as far as the eye that grew dimmer and the weary body permitted. He had the feeling that his day was declining, and he had no desire to live longer.

Das Haupt, die Füß' und Hände
Sind froh dass nun zum Ende
Die Arbeit kommen sei.

His soul was penetrated, as I know, with the old Church hymn, *O Ewigkeit, du Donnerwort*. He was ready. His death was peaceful. With gentle hand and still God took him from life. He is a God of the living and not of the dead, and we know that the dead live before Him. We trust His wisdom which is higher than our reason, and His goodness which is beyond expression. From this bier which lies under the cross of Jesus Christ we turn to ourselves and pray God that He may bless our work and that of our children. The Lord our God be gracious to us! ‘Establish Thou the work of our hands, yea the work of our hands establish Thou it!’ Amen.

At the Literary Table.

THE GOSPELS AS HISTORICAL DOCUMENTS.

Cambridge: *At the University Press.* 7s. 6d. net.

THIS is a work of great importance. Professor Stanton of Cambridge has resolved to go over all the evidence for and against the historicity (for the word must be used) of the Gospels which these many years of criticism have accumulated, and tell us how the case for the Gospels now stands.

There is no man living better fitted to do this. Professor Stanton has knowledge, patience, judgment, fairness; and he realizes the issues that are at stake.

It is a task of great magnitude. Dr. Stanton will divide it into four parts, and publish each part separately as it is ready. This is the first part. It deals with the use of the Gospels in early Christian literature. The second part will discuss the history of the composition of the Synoptic Gospels.

The third will describe the inner character of the Fourth Gospel, and compare it with the other three. The Fourth will employ two tests to ascertain the reliance that can be placed on the Gospels as true history, the first test being the agreement of what they say about the Jewish life of the time with what we know of that life from other sources, and the second test being their agreement with the remainder of the New Testament as to the rise of the Christian religion.

Of the volume before us it may be said at once that it supersedes all our text-books and introductions. No other account of the external evidence for the Gospels is necessary now or sufficient. To be sure, it is a student's book. The force of its evidence is not sent home by a powerful peroration. To feel it one must work through the evidence. But it is all clear and fair. Dr. Stanton is not most eloquent when his case is weakest. He is never eloquent and his case is never weak. The eloquence is in the steadily growing persuasion that a fair interpretation of the evidence proves the Gospels to be historical.

ROBERT LEIGHTON.

Hodder & Stoughton. 12s.

The Rev. D. Butler, M.A., F.R.S.E., is minister of the 'Tron Kirk' in Edinburgh, and author of many books. Most of his books—*Scottish Cathedrals and Abbeys*, *Henry Scougal and the Oxford Methodists*, *Wesley and Whitefield in Scotland*, and *The Ancient Church and Parish of Abernethy*—have been reviewed in our pages. They are the work of the hand of the diligent. There is no pretence in any of them that genius will make up for idleness. There is the proof rather in them all that diligence is genius, whether in gathering fact or in attractively setting it forth. The new book is a real and lasting contribution to Scottish Church biography. Leighton does not appeal to everybody. It was well that Mr. Butler, to whom he appeals intensely, his 'moderatism' being in his eyes the very spirit of the Master, the spirit of toleration which is the spirit of brotherly love—it was well that Mr. Butler was led to make his work and worth better known to us. 'While his catholicity'—we may quote some words that are characteristic of Mr. Butler and descriptive of Archbishop Leighton—'did not make him latitudinarian, nor his charity make him indifferent to

the majesty of truth and its imperious claims over the conscience, Leighton recognized as brethren all who loved the Lord Jesus, claimed an affinity to the good that was in every system, and could say all good men must unite, for they are already one in God. As in Church movements he sought to be guided more by the way of reform than of revolution, so in doctrine he would recommend unity in all that is essential, liberty in all that is doubtful, and in all things charity.'

MAN'S PLACE IN THE UNIVERSE.

Chapman & Hall. 12s. 6d. net.

So far as our experience goes, there is no argument that tells against the Incarnation so convincingly as the opinion that the men upon the earth are but an infinitesimal portion of the inhabitants of the universe. When that opinion is accepted as belief, the effect of it is instantaneous. How could God appear upon this earth and spend His time upon it, when all the other worlds were claiming His attention? it is all a fiction, begotten of the vanity of little man. The shop-boy feels the force of it as well as the philosopher, and goes for a cycle-ride on Sunday.

How have we met that effective argument hitherto? We have appealed, perhaps, to God's omnipotence? With God all things are possible; not a sparrow falleth to the ground without Him; if He looks after the animalculæ in a drop of dirty water, is it so hard to believe that He could look after the lost in a little world, with all the other worlds to attend to? It is a good argument, and it does its duty with some. But there is a better.

Dr. Alfred Russel Wallace has published a new book, which he calls by the name of *Man's Place in the Universe*. Dr. Wallace's purpose in publishing this book is to show that there are no inhabited worlds but this. That is to say, he shows that the balance of scientific probability is against the idea that the other planets are inhabited, or that there are any living persons anywhere in the whole universe of God except in this little earth of ours. It is not an apologetic for the Incarnation. It is the work of a man of science of most honourable position.

To use this argument well one must read Dr. Wallace's book, and it is as pleasant reading as one could desire to be offered. But here it

may be acceptable to set down the six sentences into which he gathers his conclusions: (1) The stellar universe forms one connected whole; and, though of enormous extent, is yet finite, and its extent determinable. (2) The solar system is situated in the plane of the Milky Way, and not far removed from the centre of that plane. The earth is therefore nearly in the centre of the stellar universe. (3) This universe consists throughout of the same kinds of matter, and is subjected to the same physical and chemical laws. [Those three are the conclusions of astronomers; the next three are Dr. Wallace's deductions, for which, he says, the probabilities are enormous.] (4) No other planet in the solar system than our earth is inhabited or habitable. (5) The probabilities are almost as great against any other sun possessing habitable planets. (6) The nearly central position of our sun is probably a permanent one, and has been specially favourable, perhaps absolutely essential, to life-development on the earth.

THE JEWISH ENCYCLOPEDIA.

Funk & Wagnalls.

The first word of the fifth volume of the *Jewish Encyclopedia* is DREYFUS, the last GOAT, and these two words give a fair idea of the range of the book. Whatever Jews have handled, wherever Jews have been, whoever has deserved well or ill of Jews, all are here. Of course the Bible is claimed, but such a subject as GOAT is not merely biblical. A separate paragraph is given to the goat in Rabbinical literature. When we read that Job's goats killed the wolves which assailed them, and that goat's milk fresh from the udder relieves pains of the heart, that of the white goat being especially beneficial, we know that we are not in the Bible, where a spade is a spade, and a goat is a goat.

Between DREYFUS and GOAT come EDELSHEIM, to whom two short paragraphs are conceded; ECCLESIASTES, which is written by Professor Margoliouth of Oxford, and is post-exilic and probably of foreign authorship; ETHICS, which is divided into five parts, biblical, apocryphal, rabbinical, philosophical, and modern, and is, after all, preposterously and provokingly short; and GENESIS, which is a revelation of modern Judaism.

For Genesis is done twice over, once by an anti-

critic and once by a critic. The critic receives barely three columns, the anti-critic twenty, including all the bibliography. The anti-critic (who is Rabbi Benno Jacob of Göttingen) charges the critics with want of scholarship, and gives seven (the perfect number) reasons for his charge. The critic, Rabbi Hirsch of Chicago, has space to set down a few bald statements only, and if we had nothing but the *Jewish Encyclopedia* to rely upon we should consider the modern criticism of Genesis appropriate occupation for Bedlam.

But it is so easy to find faults in a work of such magnitude and variety. Let us be just. The *Jewish Encyclopedia* is one of the most statesman-like undertakings of our time, and it is being carried out with patience and scholarship worthy of the twentieth century.

Other Books of the Month.

Dr. Cheyne has got ready the fourth part of his *Critica Biblica*. It is occupied with First and Second Kings (3s. net). It is as disconcerting as any part that has gone before, and leaves no room for surprise at any part that may follow. There was no prophet of the name of Nathan. The Hebrew for 'the prophet' (הנביא) is a little like the Hebrew for the 'Nadabite' (הנדיב), and we have all blundered when we have counted Nathan a prophet and sent him with a message to David. Solomon's kingdom did not stretch to the Euphrates; there was a P'rath (= Ephrath) in the Negeb, which we have mistaken for Euphrates. Naaman was not a leper, and 'if Naaman was not a leper, the whole story of his intercourse with Elisha falls to pieces.' Those who have searched for Abana and Pharpar near Damascus might have spared themselves the trouble. Abana is the river Jerahmeel, and Pharpar is the Ephrath that was mistaken for Euphrates, and both were in the Negeb.

KINSHIP AND MARRIAGE IN EARLY ARABIA.

The importance of a book is sometimes judged by the length of the notice of it in the newspapers. There could be no greater mistake. The best books, like the best cattle, need the least to be said about them. For a good book is a work of art, a unity; it is only the miscellaneous collections, unworthy of the name of book, that call for

much explanation. Robertson Smith's *Kinship and Marriage*, even in its new and up-to-date edition (A. & C. Black; 10s. 6d.), needs few words. A book of science, it has furthered the science to which it belongs appreciably. And if that science has now got beyond it here and there, the book deserves the credit, and deserves to be brought into line again. This has been done by Mr. Stanley A. Cook, with the aid of certain friends, notably the great Arabian scholar, Professor Ignaz Goldziher of Budapest. There were also notes which Robertson Smith himself had gathered between the first issue of the book and his death. And now Robertson Smith's publishers have the satisfaction of seeing one of their most creditable publications take its place again among the books which the student of religion cannot do without. Mr. Cook has proved an ideal editor. He has held his hand where many would have interfered to spoil; and when he has added a note it is worthy.

THE LARGER FAITH.

'There is a well-known story of Michael Angelo to the effect that, when on a visit to Rome, he entered the studio of Raphael, then just rising into fame. The young painter was out, and the old man proceeded to examine his work that had been left standing on the easel. It seemed to him too confined and narrow, not large and full enough, so he wrote with a piece of chalk, at the bottom of the canvas, the single word *amplius*, meaning fuller, freer, larger.'

Thus the Rev. K. C. Anderson, minister of Ward Chapel, Dundee, opens his essay or sermon on 'The Irrepressible Conflict.' It is also his motto for the whole book; it is the meaning of his title. And it is a motto and meaning we can heartily sympathize with. There is a certain narrowness in much of our modern offering of the gospel. Let us be led out into the ampler air of the love of God. But unfortunately this writer has not scholarship enough to do anything for us. His extraordinary blunder in the anecdote just quoted makes one suspect that. And the suspicion is only too well confirmed by the reading of the article on Ritschlianism, for example, where we have such enormities as 'Koftan' and (six times over) 'Pringle-Paterson,' together with a knowledge of Ritschlianism of the most elementary sort. It is a great pity. Mr. Anderson's intention is good,

but it all comes to nothing. There is plenty of general declamation, but no reliable facts or arguments, and no clear conception of even his own whereabouts.

WHO'S WHO.

That *Who's Who*, a bound volume of 1700 pages in double column, can sell at 7s. 6d. net (A. & C. Black) is a proof of the progress that literature is making. A generation ago it would have been offered at 15s. But it would not have sold then to any extent. Now all the newspaper men must have it, and all the mighty army of authors; the military and the navy find it a necessary supplement to their Lists, and the clergy to the Clergy List; the great whose names are in it must see their names there, and the ambitious must select the places where their names are yet to appear. How fascinating it is—as all brief biography is—giving you the facts, leaving you to fill in the tragedy and comedy by your imagination.

There used to be some information in the shape of tables in *Who's Who*. That is all removed now and forms a separate volume, *Who's Who Year-Book* (1s. net). It is likely to run *Whitaker* hard.

Mr. B. H. Blackwell of Oxford is the publisher of the Stanhope Essay for 1903. Its subject is *The Emperor Sigismund*, its author Mr. Archibald Main. Of Mr. Main much is expected. He has a fine record of academic honours behind him; he has a fine promise of Christian service before. This book is most reassuring. Its scholarship, its literary grace, its historic feeling are all reassuring.

Messrs. Cassell have this month issued three reprints. One is Farrar's *Life of Christ* in the large illustrated edition, with a memoir of the author by Dean Lefroy, but at half the original cost (10s. 6d.). Another is Geikie's *Holy Land and the Bible* in a slightly abridged form, and in a single volume (2s. 6d. net). And the third is a recent volume of papers by various authors on the life of Christ, entitled *The Life and Work of the Redeemer* (2s. 6d. net). The last two belong to the 'Quiver Series.' Messrs Cassell are also issuing Ellicott's Commentary in small cheap volumes.

In a new type which, although it is printed on

India paper, is as black as any type need ever be, and in binding which seems to say there is never to be an end to the improvement in leather bindings of the Bible, the Oxford University Press has issued a new edition of the Authorized Version. There is an edition with references, and an edition without. The edition with references for us. The references are themselves the work of artists, and are enough to make all the Bibles with the old references works of mere artisans.

Dr. Horton has, timidly, taken Professor Drummond's place, and supplies us with a Christmas booklet annually. This year it contains three papers which appeared in the *Christian World*. They describe three types of Christians: Matutinus, Meridianus, and Vespertinus. The title is *Morning, Noon, and Night* (James Clarke & Co.; 1s.).

From the University Tutorial Press (W. B. Clive) comes forth a second impression (right word, not edition) of Professor Stout's *Groundwork of Psychology* (4s. 6d.). It must be distinguished from Dr. Stout's *Manual of Psychology*, which is larger, dearer, and more difficult. This is the beginner's book, and it is ideal.

BY THAMES AND COTSWOLD.

The Reverend William Holden Hutton, B.D., Fellow of St. John Baptist College, Oxford, and Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Ely, has time to write great books of ecclesiastical history and biography, and to take a holiday every year. For fifteen years he has taken his holiday in the Cotswolds, and with an inexpressible desire to be writing he has made a book of it. Well, it is a book worth making. It is delightful no doubt to spend a holiday in the Cotswolds, it is delightful to read about spending it. As an ecclesiastic Mr. Hutton is most interested in the Cotswold churches, but he is interested in the manors also, and even in old street corners, and he tells some curious tales of some of them; while churches and manors and street corners are made known to us by cuts that are as dainty and delightful as the holiday and the story of it. The publishers are Messrs Constable (10s. 6d. net).

OLD CAPE COLONY.

Old Cape Colony, a Chronicle of her Men and Houses from 1652 to 1806, by Mrs. A. F. Trotter

(Constable; 10s. 6d. net). The title is appetizing and the book is as good as its title. It is written in the easy descriptive fashion of the chronicles it wades among, and it is illustrated by bits of old homesteads and quaint gables, all in excellent keeping and old world flavour. It was not an easy indulgent life those first colonists lived; there is here and there a hint of the tragedy that often accompanies beginnings, and there is always the sense of stress and push; but it is so far in the past, it only adds to the quaintness. 'If you arrive at Stellenbosch at two or three o'clock of a summer afternoon, an extraordinary stillness reigns. The whole town is asleep; shutters are closed, hardly a dog barks, the rustle of the heavy leaved branches and the tinkle of streamlets are the only audible sounds. It is said that a Stellenbosch burgher consulted his doctor for insomnia, and on being asked at what hour of the night he most suffered, exclaimed: "It is not at night that I suffer; I sleep well at night, but nowadays I cannot get to sleep in the afternoon." I do not know if the story is true. As afternoon wears on the sleepers awake: Day cools to the fresh South African evening, coffee and pipes appear on the stoep, and through flickering tree shadows the sunshine of the afternoon slants low. Alas for the time when the old-world life shall have disappeared with the gable and the stoep of the old-world builder, for they are disappearing. Never again will you find a better expression of the past, a quaint everyday past, forgotten of history and laid aside by the trend of modern thought, as in these little townships, built by a northern race, developed under a southern sun, apart from fashion and jostle, without the great ambitions which for the most part make for misery. So that for a brief time the new-comer feels as one "carried awaie by the fairies into some pleasant place."'

GEORGE FREDERICK WATTS, R.A.

The last work which Dr. Hugh Macmillan wrote, as characteristic of his genius as anything we got from him, was an estimate of the *Life-Work of George Frederick Watts, R.A.* (Dent; 4s. 6d. net). It belongs to the Temple Biographies, edited by Mr. Dugald Macfadyen. There is unbounded appreciation of the influence for good of Watts' work, and yet there is discriminating and searching criticism. But the best of the book is its wholeness. It also is a work of art quite fit to stand

beside one of the pictures it appraises and live again in minds made better by its presence. Its use is much enhanced by the reproduction of eleven of the finest paintings.

Messrs. Dent have added to their 'Temple Classics' the translation by John Healey of St. Augustine's *City of God*. It appears in three little book lovers' volumes at 1s. 6d. net each.

DANTE'S VITA NUOVA.

Messrs. Ellis & Elvey have published a new edition of D. G. Rossetti's translation of the *Vita Nuova*, and claim that it is *the* gift-book of the season. The claim is based on the illustrations mainly. All the nine are here, with all their character preserved most faithfully, and it is doubtful if anywhere else Rossetti's genius can be so fully studied at so modest a cost (5s. net). But the book itself is a work of art, paper and printing and binding being in keeping with the selectness and intimacy of the illustrations.

Professor Hermann Cremer of Greifswald (whose death we much regret to see announced) published a *Reply to Harnack*, and it has been translated by Dr. Bernhard Pick (Funk & Wagnalls; \$1 net). The great lexicographer was the right man to make this attempt. His scholarship is of course beyond cavil, and his faith is at once firm and liberal. He can deal with Harnack historically and dogmatically, but besides that he can deal with him experimentally. It is the combination of gifts that makes the Reply effective, it is the combination of just those gifts that makes a man an apologist in these days—an apologist in the scientific sense.

The Rev. Charles A. Hall has written, and Mr. Gardner of Paisley has published, a very small book on *The Art of Being Healthy*. The subject is very pressing, and the book is very sane.

THE BOOK OF JEREMIAH.

There is no book of the Bible for which the commentator can do more than the Book of Jeremiah. The Rev. George Douglas of Edinburgh found this out in the course of his study of the Bible, and then sat down to be his own commentator on Jeremiah. That is the best way for us all. But next to that may come the reading of so safe and sensible a commentator as Mr. Douglas.

He is learned without parade. The only point of scholarship we should question is the spelling of a little word. *Tel* ought to be *tell*. It was Professor Sayce that introduced *tel*, but only for Tel-el-Amarna, because he found that the natives there hung on the vowel, as natives elsewhere did not do. Mr. Douglas is not merely learned, however. He is practical. He knows from experience where learning is needed, and how much is needed, and where the Word may be left to itself. His notes are few, the sifting, we can believe, of many more, and they are always enlightening.

OLD TESTAMENT CRITICISM.

The full title of Professor M'Fadyen's new book is *Old Testament Criticism and the Christian Church* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s.). It is not an exposition of the Higher Criticism; it is not a refutation. It is a word of instruction and advice to the Church of Christ, that the Church of Christ of our day may not be laughed at by the generations to come. The Church is greatly in need of this instruction and advice. Some little time ago Professor Davidson remarked that the Higher Criticism was getting to be known, some of the bishops had heard of it. Now the correspondents of the religious papers have heard of it. It has been their great and burning question for some weeks past. Have they been asleep till now? Now they are awake, and to read their letters is to see how great their need of instruction and advice is, especially of instruction. Professor M'Fadyen is a serious, responsible Church teacher. No one who reads his book will make himself foolish any more in the newspapers.

THE STORY OF MY LIFE.

Helen Keller tells it, and it is very wonderful. She tells it in beautiful English, and with warmth of colour and wealth of literary suggestion; and she has been stone blind as well as deaf and dumb since she was a child. But yet the most moving part of the book to us has been that which contains the letters of Helen's teacher. Few women of our generation seem to us to be so great as Anne Mansfield Sullivan. Her work was limited to the education of a single pupil; she did not grumble at that, though she had ability and enthusiasm that would have given her a place in the foremost ranks of public teachers; but she did that work so perfectly, with such foresight, patience, womanliness, that no position could have given her a better opportunity

or have been more advantageously seized. Her letters are the most educative writing on education—we might say on human capacity—that we have read for a long time (Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d.).

SOME LEADING IDEAS OF HINDUISM.

Of all the subjects that occupy the minds of men few are more difficult to make intelligible than Hinduism. Yet there is such a craving for the knowledge of Hinduism at present that many are tempted to undertake the task of describing it. The Rev. Henry Haigh was called on suddenly to fill a gap last year and deliver the Fernley Lecture, and of all subjects he chose Hinduism. What he said we cannot tell. This is what he wrote out afterwards in the leisure of his study with his books around him (Kelly; 2s. 6d.). But he knew that he knew something about Hinduism. He had studied it on the spot. He had been fascinated by its very complexity. He made no fool of himself we may believe, when he spoke, and when he wrote he wrote a book which is quite intelligible to the ordinary reader, and yet may be enjoyed by the student of Comparative Religion. The leading ideas which Mr. Haigh has chosen for exposition are Transmigration and Pantheism. The latter is the test. It is mastered, and made possible to master.

Mr. Kelly has published a revised edition of *A Handbook of Theology*, by the Rev. John Harries. It is unknown to the great dogmatic historians, but it has taught many an earnest local preacher which be the first principles of the oracles of God.

THE PARABLES OF GOD AND OF MAN.

This title is not definite enough to be attractive. But we should be prepared to be the author's advocate, and say that the subject does not allow of greater definiteness in describing it. In any case, it is the title of a remarkable book. The reconciliation of science and religion is its charitable but somewhat unpromising purpose. The way, however, is so original and so likely, that no previous disappointment should prevent us from reading Mr. Shepherd's book. If its thought could be caught in a sentence it might be this, that science has to do with effects, and therefore is only a parable of the truth, which covers the unseen causes as well as the visible effects. But that conveys nothing, perhaps. Try the book itself. It is published by Messrs. Longmans at 3s. net.

THE STUDY OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY.

The true teacher is he who teaches how to learn, not he who teaches what there is to be learned. And when the pupil is unfortunate enough to miss the instruction of the true teacher, there are books for him like this of Professor Collins. Not ecclesiastical history, but how to study ecclesiastical history, that is the subject of Professor Collins' book. It is in line with all the recent advance in educational method. It is in touch with all the recent progress in historical investigation. For an impending examination in some period of the history of the Church it is useless; but for the making of a student of the Church it is essential. In no part of the subject does Professor Collins show mastery more than in the chapter on the choice of books. The volume, it should have been mentioned, is one of Longmans' 'Handbooks for the Clergy' (2s. 6d. net).

Messrs. Macmillan have published the Bishop of Rochester's Pastoral Charge for 1903. Its subject is *The Church's Failures and the Work of Christ* (1s. net). The Bishop of Rochester has convictions and language to express them. He says that Archbishop Temple 'had to spend two-thirds of his strength and opportunity in patient encounter with controversy provoked by folly and pursued with bigotry.' And then, preliminary to his subject, he says, 'I shall say nothing here of the Education Question, tempting as it is to make some reply to the torrents of invective which represent us all, and especially the bishops, in the light of brigands.'

FANNY BURNEY.

Apparently Mr. Austin Dobson has no great opinion of Fanny Burney's literary gift. She has received her place among the 'English Men of Letters' (Macmillan; 2s. net), and he has undertaken to vindicate the choice. But he is much more interested in Fanny Burney than in Fanny Burney's writings. What he has written is a biography, fit for the Dictionary of National Biography, not a literary estimate. There is a chapter, to be sure, on 'The Successful Author,' but observe the adjective; and all through the chapter Mr. Dobson lets escape his wonder at the success. Fanny Burney was a charming little woman, who kept her good looks many days and had admirers and lovers, who included her writings

in their admiration, but if it had not been for Fanny Burney, we should have heard less of Fanny Burney's writings. We may be of another mind from Mr. Dobson. We may admire Fanny Burney's writings as much as Dr. Samuel Johnson or Sir Joshua Reynolds did. But even if we are of the same mind we shall heartily enjoy his honest garrulous biography, which even a woman could not have written better.

THE LEGENDARY LIFE OF CHRIST.

Those whose curiosity has been excited by the reading of occasional anecdotes of the life of Christ which are not contained in the Gospels, may now have it satisfied and even satiated. The Rev. James de Quincey Donehoo, M.A., has gone over all the books and extracts from books in existence that touch on the extra-canonical life of Christ, and he has woven the whole marvellous and ridiculous story into a continuous web of narrative (Macmillan; 10s. 6d. net). It is possible to read this new life of Christ just as if it were a new 'Gospel.' It is possible; but it is not probable that many persons will do it, for it is a wearisome wading business. However, Mr. Donehoo has done all that an editor can do. Though the life is given in the form of a continuous narrative, he never fails to mark the sources of each incident, while his footnotes give ample opportunity for criticism and collation. It is a scholar's book. No one need be suspicious of it. But it is a book that need not be confined to scholars.

THE GROWTH OF THE SOUL.

There is no doubt that the books which are most popular, are the books which are most commonplace. If we were to call Dr. Amory Bradford's new book commonplace we should be guilty of disparagement, for the word itself has offence in it. But Dr. Bradford himself would readily acquiesce that he has nothing to say that has not been said before, and that he claims only to set it beautifully and say it well. His book is called (in this country) *The Growth of the Soul* (Melrose; 5s.), there being already a book called *The Ascent of the Soul*, its title in America.

FRANCIS OF ASSISI.

Miss Anna M. Stoddart has added a life of St. Francis to Methuen's 'Little Biographies' (3s. 6d.). She has written it for the people, she says, not for

the specialist in Assisi literature. But her conception of what the people need is not the old one. She has spent time in Rome and Assisi, seen the libraries, read the books, and interviewed the authorities. Her very selection of illustrations implies a new conception of what the people need. They are both artistic and interpretative. As for the style of writing, there is no display of eleutionary fireworks, but there is a sense of a great spiritual presence ever near; it is the presence not of St. Francis simply but of his Lord, a blent presence, giving inspiration and responsibility.

THE FIRST PRAYER-BOOK OF KING EDWARD VI.

The Rev. Vernon Staley, Provost of the Cathedral Church of St. Andrew, Inverness, has undertaken the editorship of a 'Library of Liturgiology and Ecclesiology for English Readers.' The volumes are printed on good paper in clear clean type at the De La More Press, and published by Mr. Moring. The first volume we seem to have missed. The second has reached us. It is *The First Prayer-Book of King Edward VI.* (5s. net).

It is a reprint, *verbatim et literatim*, of the first English Book of Common Prayer, issued in 1549. But there were two editions in 1559; which has Mr. Staley chosen? He has chosen the earlier. It was issued in the month of March. It was issued in parts, with irregular foliation. But Lathbury proved that it was earlier than the regularly paged edition, which came out only in May. Mr. Staley has followed the text of the earlier issue, and the pagination of the second.

The interest attaching to this the very first prayer-book of the Protestant Church in England is of course very great. Like first editions of everything else, it was not a new thing. It was made up out of service-books which were there already. But it marked the sense of the Church's unity and strengthened it. Indeed the prayer-book, more than the bishop's staff, has been the bond of union in all the generations, and successive changes have never shifted the centre of attachment. It is now possible to estimate, not through the study of a student's manual, but by very pleasant fireside reading, what those changes have been. And more than that, this handsome scholarly edition will bring the reader into touch with the very atmosphere in which the Church of the days of King Edward VI. lived.

We have no copy of the original with which to test the accuracy of Mr. Staley's reprint, but we have Keeling's serviceable *Liturgie Britannica* beside us, and its witness so far as it goes is altogether reassuring.

ST. ANSELM.

The Open Court Publishing Company of Chicago has a 'Religion of Science Library.' Most of its volumes are written by the general editor, Dr. Paul Carus. But the latest two are not. One of them is translated by him. It is Lao-tze's Tao Teh King, which appears under the English title of *The Canon of Reason and Virtue* (1s. 6d.). The other is a translation of St. Anselm's Proslogium, Monologium, and Cur Deus Homo, together with Gaunilon's appendix to the Monologium, 'In Behalf of the Fool.' The title is simply *St. Anselm* (2s. 6d.). The books are unbound. The editor is so well satisfied with Welch's *St. Anselm* in the 'Epoch-Makers' series that he counts it unnecessary to furnish a biography; but he gives quotations from Weber on Anselm's place in philosophy, and from Descartes, Spinoza, Locke, Leibnitz, Kant, Hegel, Dörner, Lotze, and Flint, by way of criticism of his ontological argument.

Messrs. Passmore & Alabaster have published *Smooth Stones taken from Ancient Brooks* (2s. 6d.), by the late C. H. Spurgeon. 'Ancient Brooks' was Mr. Spurgeon's facetious way of naming the Puritan, Thomas Brooks. The 'Smooth Stones' are short paragraphs from the writings of Thomas Brooks, 'and may the Lord direct them to the very forehead of thy sins, for this is the author's main design.'

The same publishers have issued *Spurgeon's Illustrated Almanack* for 1904 (1d.), and *John Ploughman's Sheet Almanack* (1d.).

MAN AND THE DIVINE ORDER.

This is the title of the latest of Mr. Horatio W. Dresser's books (Putnams; 7s. 6d.). Mr. Dresser is almost the prophet of a new Religion, and his books are its Scripture. It is not, however, a Religion that breaks away from Christianity altogether. In Jesus of Nazareth was seen the highest that we know of Religion, a Religion so high as still to be an example. He was only an example, however. What He did for men He did by showing them how to do it for themselves.

He did nothing in the room and stead of men. And there was no need. For men are not lost, they are simply ignorant. Salvation is in seeing better. What men must see better is that all things are working out the will of God, according to the method of evolution. They have to get into the stream of God's evolutionary method of working in the world; let all effort go, all effort at the improvement of self or society, simply get into touch with the tendency towards fuller light, and allow that tendency to work out their salvation without any fear or trembling whatever. Jesus did that, and on that account He is so good an example. But how it came to pass that He did it so supremely so long ago, when evolution is still steadily making progress, Mr. Dresser does not say. The thing that Mr. Dresser most abhors is social work. Leave people alone; leave everybody alone, leave yourself alone; God is love, and *He* will carry you all on and land you safe. 'Of course, if God is love, there are no "lost" souls in the literal sense of the word, although many may be almost infinitely removed from the knowledge of the truth which sets men free.' But however far removed, you can do nothing for them. 'There are no elect or damned.' There is no difference among men except degrees of ignorance; and to cure that—'the way is open before those who choose to walk in it.'

The new issues of the Rationalist Press Association (Watts; 6d. each) are Mill's *Liberty*, McCabe's *Haeckel's Critics Answered*, Count de Renesse's *Jesus Christ* (surely it was a mistake to print his portrait on the cover), and Emerson's *Addresses and Sermons*.

CHAMPIONS OF THE TRUTH.

This is to be the title of a new series of books which the Religious Tract Society has undertaken. This is also the special title of the first volume of the series (3s. 6d.). It is a collection of lives of men who were famous for their goodness and courage in the battle, written by men who are famous for their goodness and literary skill. The editor is the Rev. A. R. Buckland, M.A.

The Religious Tract Society has also undertaken a cheaper (1s. 6d.) series of the same general character. Two volumes are out, one on *Wesley* by G. Holden Pike, the other on *Wilberforce* by Travers Buxton, M.A. It will be difficult to find

better books than these for the Sunday-school library or the home.

But another R.T.S. book must be noticed. It is the *Scripture Pocket Book* for 1904 (1s. 6d. net).

HYMNS AND HYMN TUNES.

'I desired a text-book from which my students might obtain a comprehensive knowledge of the history and use of sacred song, without being burdened with those technical details which a beginner has neither the time to master nor the ability to understand. I also desired a book in which the study of hymns and of tunes was combined.'

And when the Rev. David R. Breed, D.D., of the Western Theological Seminary, found that there was no such book in existence, he sat down and wrote it (Revell; 5s. net). It is so little encumbered with 'technical details' that one would have said it is written for those who read for the mere love of reading, not for students of any kind. Perhaps the word 'student' has a wider use in America than here. Perhaps it would cover the members of our Bible classes. For them the book is excellently adapted. Its most original part is the musical part. In the combination of the two parts in one book there lies an opportune training in the practice of setting the right tune to the right words.

The best book on the International Lessons, so far as we have seen, is *Arnold's Practical Commentary* (Revell; 2s. 6d. net). It is a packed book. It gives the full text of all the lessons in both the Authorized and Revised Versions; it gives a word-for-word commentary; it gives questions; and of course it gives diagrams and black-board sketches on every other page.

CANON LAW.

Dr. Philip Lempriere is the author of *A Compendium of the Canon Law for the use of the Clergy and Theological Students of the Church in Scotland commonly called the Scottish Episcopal Church*, and the St. Giles Printing Co. of Edinburgh are the publishers. The book is printed in a smaller type than even theological students are now accustomed to, but it is well printed, and as a student's book highly attractive. The subject is an immense and intricate one. To make a compendium of it, and to make it readable, was no light undertaking. Dr. Lempriere has adopted every device to catch

the eye and fix the attention. He has mastered the subject, and moves easily through it. And he has spared himself no toil or trouble. We doubt if any Church can furnish a book that is better adapted to its purpose.

MORALS.

Under this short title (in the French, *La Morale*) Professor G. L. Duprat writes his introduction to the modern and (he holds) only scientific study of Ethics. The book is translated by Mr. W. J. Greenstreet, and published by Messrs. Walter Scott in their 'Contemporary Science' series (6s.).

The modern and only scientific study of Ethics bases morality upon a combination of two sciences—Psychology and Sociology. Philosophy cannot tell you how to be moral, nor discover what morality is. Religion cannot discover what morality is, nor (unless you are of 'those who are in need of belief and to whom a prophet or saint brings the faith for which they crave') tell you how to be moral. Professor Duprat holds that religion is much more dependent upon morality than morality upon religion. The only way to find out what is moral and what immoral, and the only way to make immoral persons moral, is to propagate the study of Psychology and of Sociology, and from the results arrived at form conclusions and direct conduct.

Professor Duprat does not allow religion its real influence. He even goes so far as to say that ('leaving out of account the belief in the Divinity of Christ,' as he amusingly adds in a small-type footnote) Christianity is to be explained by the craving of freedmen and slaves for pity, love, and fraternity—which is more drastically secular than Gibbon. But those who do allow its place to the religious sanction can welcome the aid of every science, and Professor Duprat makes out a good case for the place of Psycho-sociology.

AN AGNOSTIC'S APOLOGY.

If the only deadly enemy of the Faith is Materialism, we may welcome Sir Leslie Stephen as an ally. But his Agnosticism is so aggressively sceptical that it is not easy to fight by his side. He seems more bent on exposing our deficiencies, or what he considers our deficiencies, than in ranging himself at our side to face a common foe. We are driven to retort upon him instead of reckoning upon his comradeship. And the retort is

this, that he takes to do with things which he does not understand. He is not a theologian, he is not an exegete; those who have given some study to exegesis and theology see plainly that he is not, that he has not given study to these things; and yet he writes as if no one knew the Bible but himself. Speaking of St. Paul's chapter on the Resurrection, he says that 'the one noble outburst of rhetoric in it has to be reached through strange, tortuous, special pleadings, arguments from superstitious practices, false analogies about "wheat or some other grain," and the queer irrelevance about evil communications corrupting good manners.' That is not the language of one who has studied the passage, it is the language of one who has heard the Burial Service, and heard it unsympathetically. Even if Sir Leslie Stephen is granted the superior wisdom from whose cold height he criticises the faith of lesser people, he should be told to bear in mind Tennyson's warning—

Leave thou thy sister when she prays,
Her early heaven, her happy views;
Nor thou with shadowed hint confuse
A life that leads melodious days.

But he is more concerned now,—for is he not a member of that most aggressive Rationalist Association of our day?—to deny the reality than to affirm the possibility of the knowledge of God. His *Agnostic's Apology* (Smith, Elder, & Co.; 7s. 6d.) has reached its second edition.

ST. ALDHELM.

The Bishop of Bristol was once known as the Disney Professor of Art and Archæology in the University of Cambridge. It is no surprise, therefore, that he should choose St. Aldhelm for a series of Cathedral lectures, and that he should go so thoroughly into his subject. Here is a considerable book, published by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge (5s.); but then he who reads it knows St. Aldhelm and St. Aldhelm's times.

Under the curious title of *The First Year of Responsibility* (1s. 6d. net), Messrs. Swan Sonnenschein have published an intimate talk which Maynard Butler had with a boy. It was the beginning of his first year at school, and the talk was on the supreme excellence of character. The Master of Trinity, whose name is Butler also, but who has no knowledge of or kinship with the

author, thinks the little book worth an introduction. It is worth it.

HERBARTIANISM.

This is a lively defence of the Herbartian theory of education by Dr. F. H. Hayward (Sonnenschein; 4s. 6d.). Its liveliest part is, however, its appendix—the sting is in the tail—where the newly appointed Professor of Education in Edinburgh receives merciless castigation for daring to disparage Herbart's pedagogy. 'The most prominent feature of Mr. Darroch's criticism is its persistent irrelevancy,'—that is the first sentence. The last is, 'The fact is, Mr. Darroch wrote in a hurry, and did not do justice either to himself or to the men from whom he hastily gathered ideas. He is surely capable of better things than this.'

One of the most urgent questions that face the Church of England is what to do with the Psalms in worship. There are those who hold, and have held for long, that the lengthened repetition of the Psalms, in obsolete language and without any clue to their meaning or application, is the chief reason 'why people do not go to church.' Perhaps the disease is too radical for so simple a remedy, but the Rev. G. H. S. Walpole, D.D., of Durham, deserves the thanks of all men for the effort he has made in *The People's Psalter* (Elliot Stock; 2s. net) to give the Psalms a meaning as they stand and a modern application. It is a ripe scholar's loving service for Christ.

The *Monthly Visitor* for 1903 (Office, 68 Hanover Street, Edinburgh; 3d.) is an unrivalled messenger of glad tidings. There is no silly sentiment about its 'red-hot evangelism.' The gospel it brings is the gospel of the grace of God that teaches us to deny ungodliness and worldly lusts and to live soberly.

The Church of England S.S. Institute has issued the second of its five-years' course of Lessons. The Lessons on the Morning and Evening Prayer are by the Rev. Edwin Hobson, M.A.; those on the New Testament by the Rev. H. D. S. Sweetapple, M.A.; and those on the Old Testament by the Rev. J. Wagstaff, B.D. The Institute has also issued *Bible Illustrations* by the Rev. Philip Williams, M.A.

GITA AND GOSPEL.

'On the one hand we have the imaginative portrait of Krishna, surrounded by millions of adoring worshippers—touching spectacle! On the other stands the historical Jesus of Nazareth, Son of Man and Son of God, stretching out His nail-pierced hands to India, as He says, Come unto Me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Rightly read, the *Gita* is a clear-tongued prophecy of Christ, and the hearts that bow down to the idea of Krishna are really seeking the incarnate Son of God.'

That passage, well on in Mr. Neil Alexander's book, is its sum and substance. It is a book of most Christian appreciation and scholarship (Thacker, Spink, & Co.).

FACES TOWARD THE LIGHT.

A good title for a poor book. It is said to be devotional, but as there is no thinking there cannot be much devotion in it (Vir Publishing Company; 4s. net). The same publishers, however, issue an excellent *Pastor's Pocket Record*, the best we have seen (2s. net).

MY STRUGGLE FOR LIGHT.

Wimmer's *Struggle for Light* was well worth translating and adding to Messrs. Williams & Norgate's 'Crown Theological Library' (3s. 6d.). For it is a book of beautiful intention and most sincere aspiration. Wimmer would get behind theology to the love and self-sacrifice; and if he finds that with the theology there goes also the miraculous, even the resurrection of Jesus from the dead, we shake our heads, and say, 'Ye have taken away my Lord now,' but we still recognize the purity of his intention, the sincerity of his spirit.

Illustrated and Smaller Gift Books.

Pomiuk, by William Forbush (Marshall Brothers), is the story of a little Eskimo boy, who was taken care of by Dr. Grenfell. The first part of the book gives a good account of the life led by the Eskimos. But Mr. Forbush has not yet learned the art of telling stories. He does not tell Pomiuk's story well. He leaves us to guess much of it, or put it together from hints in letters. And as for the other boys who are introduced after Pomiuk dies, we never take to them. The illustrations are the best of the book.

Two Artillerymen; or, Light in Darkness, by E. C.

Rundle Woolcock (R.T.S.; 2s.), is the life-story of two men—Gunner Cordell and Sergeant-Major Sidney Broads. The best part of the book is the description of 'Little Sunshine.'

A new edition of Hawthorne's works is being published by Messrs. Brown Langham & Company. The volumes are most pleasant to handle. They are small, only about six inches long, and their type is particularly clear. They can be had in two bindings—leather, 2s. 6d. net; and cloth, 1s. 6d. net. The special feature of the edition is Professor Katharine Bates' critical introduction to each volume. The first volume is just out. It is *The Scarlet Letter*.

What can I Do; or, How to Help Missions, by Annette Whymper (R.T.S.; 1s. 6d.), is a real addition to the missionary library. Extensive accounts of different missions and missionaries we have in abundance, but many people are not sufficiently interested in missions to read these. For such people Miss Whymper has written her book. The two chapters which we found most interesting were 'Missionary Helpers' and 'Congo Missions.' The first of these describes graphically how Lydia Lipton, a poor woman, managed to earn £4 every year to keep a little Hindoo girl at a Christian school. The second tells how the members of a certain guild wished to get into direct touch with a particular missionary, and how they succeeded. The last fifty pages of the book are occupied with short stories and poetry for the children, to try to give them also a personal interest in missions.

The seventy-ninth volume of *Young People* (2s.) has just been issued from the Methodist New Connexion Room. Its bill of fare is as appetizing as usual. The two most attractive items are the short sketches by Myra Hamilton, called 'Fancy Flower Land,' and the serial story, 'Zip.' The volume is bound in red and gold, and contains many illustrations.

A new volume of the 'Splendid Lives' Series has just been published. It is the life of *John Howard*, by Lena Orman Cooper (Sunday School Union; 1s.). Miss Cooper's biography is a personal one. It deals with John Howard as a man rather than John Howard as a philanthropist. In the author's preface she says: 'In these days there is a keen desire to know something of the inner lives of our celebrated men. For this reason I have garnered many details of the home life of John Howard, and have tried to furnish a faithful and intimate picture of the Prisoner's Friend in the more private relations of life.'

From the Sunday School Union has just come the annual volume of the *Golden Rule* (2s.). It contains many attractive items, some of which are unique, such for instance as the 'Golden Rule Bookshelf,' which is conducted by the Rev. A. Smellie, and short monthly papers on gardening, by M. M. Rankin. There is also a splendid serial story running through the volume called the 'Kinkaid Venture.' The illustrations are well executed, and the binding is bright.

The Catacombs of Città Vecchia, in the Island of Malta.

BY THE REV. G. AIRD SIM, MINISTER OF ST. ANDREW'S SCOTS CHURCH, VALLETTA, MALTA.

THE limestone terraces in the vicinity of Città Vecchia, the ancient capital of Malta, are honeycombed with rock tombs. Many of them are of a Phœnician type. According to Diodorus Siculus and Strabo the Phœnicians were the first colonists of Malta. 'The twin islands of Melita and Gaulos lay immediately in the way of the Phœnician adventurers. They became Phœnician settlements. . . . They were sites, not of mere factories, but of independent Phœnician communities' (Freeman, *History of Sicily*, vol. i.).

From these tombs Phœnician inscriptions, coins, statuettes, sarcophagi, and pottery of an archaic form have been recovered. The human remains found in them are more or less entire skeletons.

In the same district another type of tomb exists in considerable numbers, which have been found to contain ornamented pottery of a classical form, articles in metal, Greek and Roman coins, and inscriptions. In such tombs the human remains are generally charred bones and ashes, contained in urns.

But the most interesting and elaborate of the rock tombs of Malta consist of catacombs, similar to those of Rome, Naples, and Syracuse, though excavated on a smaller scale than these. No adequate description of the Malta catacombs has yet been published in England. They are briefly referred to in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* (9th edition; vol. v.), s.v. 'Catacombs,' but the author of the article has evidently not seen them personally, and falls into the mistake of saying that they contain 'no vestiges of painting, sculpture, or inscriptions.' The same author (Canon Venables) has but a single sentence regarding them in Smith's *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, vol. i. p. 316, art. 'Catacombs.' Even the new volume (xxx.) of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, art. 'Malta,' has only a slightly fuller account of them, based on Caruana's recent explorations and opinion.

The following description of these catacombs is the result of repeated visits to the sites themselves,

and a somewhat minute study of the ancient and modern evidence regarding them.

There are catacombs in at least three other districts of Malta, but those to be dealt with at present all lie in close proximity to the outskirts of the town of Città Vecchia, and consist of seven sets, each separate from its neighbour. Their modern names are as follow:—(1) St. Paul's, (2) St. Agatha's, (3) St. Venera's, (4) St. Cataldus, (5) Virtù, (6) St. Maria della Grotta, (7) L'Abbatia. Three of them—the first, second, and last named—have been explored and surveyed within recent years. The others are still blocked up with débris, and remain unexplored up to the present: an investigation of them is much to be desired. Painstaking monographs on those which have been opened up and examined have been compiled by a learned Maltese, the Rev. A. A. Caruana, D.D., to whom much credit is due for his labours, and to whom I am indebted for many facts discovered by him during his investigations.

The largest, and probably the oldest, of the Città Vecchia catacombs, is the one adjacent to the parish Church of St. Paul there, and it may be taken as typical of the rest. It is mentioned by Commendatore Abela in his *Malta Illustrata* (1647), and by Mons. Onorato Bres in his *Malta Antica Illustrata* (1816), neither of whom, however, was able to explore it fully. In 1894 this interesting place was thoroughly examined and measurements of it taken. It occupies an area of about 2590 square yards, and has two entrances, one large and prominent, and the other narrow and secluded. The latter passes through a primitive rock tomb, on the wall of which were discovered the remains of a partly decipherable Phœnician inscription. Beyond this lies the catacomb proper, a network of passages cut in the soft limestone rock, with two central crypts of considerable size. The passages are lined with *loculi*, some large enough to hold three bodies, some for one full-grown person, and some for children. But the distinctive feature of this and the neighbouring catacombs is a series of arched tombs (*arcosolia*), of elaborate construction. Each arched tomb consists of an oblong platform

of rock about four feet high. On each of its four sides the platform is surmounted by an open arch, forming one piece with its base and with the rock roof above. The platform itself is sometimes a plain flat surface, hollowed into a sepulchre underneath, whose opening is a small square doorway in the side. More frequently the flat surface above is excavated into a coffin-shaped receptacle of two or three compartments, each with a crescent-shaped cavity for the head. The rock coffin thus formed was doubtless closed by an inscribed slab on the top, but such covers have all disappeared. In some of the Città Vecchia catacombs these arched tombs have sides ornamented with carved mouldings and the roof with circular scale-shaped patterns. The sepulchres in the catacomb of St. Paul are estimated to number over 900. The two crypts in the same catacomb present some interesting features. The largest has at either end a raised platform of rock, containing a shallow circular excavation, whose edge is raised and plastered, except at one point, where there is an opening. It has been asserted that this is the lower part or bed of a handmill for grinding corn. As the excavation is plastered, and the stone out of which it is cut is exceedingly soft and friable, this explanation of its purpose is not satisfactory. It is apparently too shallow and small for a baptistery, but was evidently intended to contain water. Dr. Caruana's hypothesis is that it was a basin used in connexion with washing the bodies of the dead (cf. Ac 9³⁷) before they were placed in winding-sheets and committed to the adjacent tombs.

The smaller crypt has a shallow oblong cavity, sunk in the rock floor and fronting a large niche or recess in the side wall, on which there are faint traces of painting. The roof above this cavity is higher than the rest of the roof of the crypt, and is surrounded with an ornamental cornice. Dr. Caruana conjectures that this may mark the place of a *confessio*, on which rested the sarcophagus of a martyr. As far as can be ascertained, all the tombs in St. Paul's catacomb are empty. It is believed that the bones once resting there were transferred, at some unrecorded date, to an early mediæval cemetery which forms part of the precincts of the present parish Church of St. Paul. Abela relates that in 1640 a pit was discovered under a crypt in that cemetery containing a great number of human remains piled in order above

each other. The following inscription was then placed above the spot:—

D. O. M.
 Vetustissimum Christianorum
 Ossuarium
 Temporum Injuria Olim Dilapsum
 Terraque Obrutum
 An. Salutis MDCXL Repertum
 Ne Fidelium Animæ
 Sacris Careret Suffragiis
 Neve Religiosum Deperiret Monumentum
 Pii Concives
 Eruere Instaurareq. Curavere.

In connexion with this, the question remains to be discussed: Are the catacombs of Città Vecchia of pagan or of Christian origin and use? They are evidently the burial-places of people who inhabited the neighbouring city. Some facts may be given which seem more or less decisive as to who these people were, and the epoch to which they belonged.

1. The Città Vecchia catacombs are not primitive Phœnician sepulchres. Such sepulchres abound in Malta, both in isolated single examples and in small clusters, but they all have certain well-marked features of their own, which are wanting in the local catacombs. The box-like burial chamber of the Phœnicians, with its small square doorway, is not a characteristic of the catacombs, whose leading types of tomb are either the simple *loculus* or the elaborate *arcosolium*.

2. Few things about early Christianity are more noticeable than the way in which its followers felt themselves to be a community united to each other in life and death by the tie of a common faith. To this the catacombs at Rome and elsewhere bear eloquent witness. And the similar constructions at Malta are large common cemeteries under ground, in which many were laid together, as if members of one society.

3. The burial inscriptions of the Maltese catacombs hitherto explored have, unfortunately, nearly all perished. That such inscriptions once existed is a fact, attested both by Abela and by Niederstedt, in his *Malta vetus et nova*, in which he speaks of the Malta catacombs as follows:—
 'Maltam subterraneam voco quod certis speluncis in vivo saxo excavatis, veluti civitas quaedam condita est . . . cujus in parietibus continuo hinc inde sepulturæ visuntur ex inciso lapide nec non vetustissimis characteribus inscripta epitaphia cum defunctorum nominibus' (B. Niederstedt, *Malta*

vetus et nova, Helmstadii, 1660). But Niederstedt neither records in what language the epitaphs of which he speaks were written, nor the contents of a single one of them.

It is not impossible that when the catacombs of St. Cataldus, St. Venera, etc., are explored, some interesting finds may be made. Meanwhile the few surviving inscriptions which have been discovered are all the more important. In the catacomb of St. Paul there is only one which is still extant in a fair state of preservation, but it is a somewhat remarkable one. It was first noticed by the Rev. Gatt Said, rector of the Church of St. Paul's Grotto, who describes his discovery thus: 'Searching our catacombs one fine day, we found, almost by chance, a picture which appears to represent a person who died a martyr.' On the plastered wall of an arched tomb is depicted, in red paint, the figure of a woman sitting with outstretched arms, the hands, apparently bound, resting on a short column. Above the figure is painted the symbol ✱. Above the symbol are inscribed, also in red paint, the letters EYTYXIN(?)H. The first five letters are quite clear, but the sixth and seventh are not so distinct. The slanting stroke of the N appears to be prolonged so as almost to meet the preceding I: thus, IN. The name therefore appears to be Eutuchinè, a probable misspelling of Eutuchianè. Eutuchianè would of course be the correct feminine of the masculine Eutuchianos, a name borne by (among others) a bishop of Rome in the third century. If this reading is correct, it is a curious coincidence that, not far from St. Paul's catacomb, a small family cemetery was discovered in 1892, having inscribed on its entrance the single word EYTYXIANOY. Dr. Caruana considers that the figure represents a female confessor with her wrists bound. A replica of the whole is preserved in the museum of the public library at Valletta. The letters above the figure are uncial, and traced in bold broad strokes. Several points in connexion with this inscription may be noticed. First, it is not cut or scratched on the plaster, but written in paint. In the Roman catacombs, according to Northcote, this is a mark of the oldest inscriptions. Next, the inscription is Greek, not Latin. 'Speaking generally,' says the same authority, 'the use of the Greek language on epitaphs of the (Roman) catacombs is a note of antiquity. De Rossi considers that it creates a presumption that the

epitaph in question was written before the middle of the third century.' Lastly, it is an extremely simple inscription, consisting of a single word, with a cruciform symbol below it. De Rossi says that simplicity is a main characteristic of the more ancient inscriptions in the Christian catacombs of Rome. 'Often they are bare names, and nothing else. Often, however, symbols of various kinds, and especially those which had a secret Christian meaning, are added to inscriptions of this class, which are to be met with very abundantly in the most ancient parts of the catacombs.' If we may apply these data to this unique inscription in St. Paul's catacomb in Malta, it may, perhaps, be safely concluded that it is a Christian epitaph, and that of an early period, possibly 250-300 A.D. It has probably escaped the fate of the other epitaphs in the catacomb, owing to (1) its obscure and lowly position (in a narrow passage and near the ground), (2) its being painted on a hard, finely-grained plaster, and (3) not being on a movable stone or sepulchral slab, but on a solid wall.

In various spots in the neighbourhood of the catacombs at Città Vecchia a few other Christian epitaphs have been found. On a marble fragment, discovered near the catacomb of St. Venera, are engraved part of the symbol ✱ and the following words:—

... BA IN PACE BIXIT
VKLS AGUSTAS.

On a lead tablet, found among the rubbish of a wall, is the inscription—

D. M.
FUFICA CALENE
CURTIUS OIADVS
IDOMENO COIVGI
ECERV. T. . VALER . . .
BENEMERENTI.

Beneath the inscription is a dove with an olive branch, a common Christian symbol in the Roman catacombs.

On a stone, found behind the Church of St. Publius at Città Vecchia, is this epitaph—

IN IACET
BONE MEMORIE
BO Q . . BIXIT
IN . . . SEC. LO AN
NIS LV E. Q. . EBIT
IN . . CE . . . OS. III KAL SE.
TE. BRE INDICTIO
NE ECIMA.

Adjoining the small catacomb of 'L'Abbatia' is a little family cemetery, which has, on one of its subterranean vaults, this inscription in red paint, as read by Caruana—

RI
 CV.
 . IONIS . . . EPOSITA
 IN HOC . . . CORPOR.

In his *Storia Ecclesiastica Di Malta* (Malta, 1877), Mr. A. Ferris describes what is apparently the same epitaph in a more perfect condition, as it was copied in 1838 by its first discoverers—

NOT
 N ITO
 BIXITINPAC
 PACEMANISTACV
 ATIONIS P'SITAE
 INH'CAOCO RECOR.

One of the latest of such epitaphs was found in a sepulchre within Città Vecchia. It is in Greek, and records the resting-place of 'The Venerable Domesticus, Christian and Physician, who died, aged 73, in 810 A.D.'

4. The symbolic decorations of the Città Vecchia catacombs are significant. Comm. Abela mentions having seen on the wall of one of the crypts in St. Paul's catacomb the monogram XP within a raised laurel wreath, and gives an engraving of it in his book. This has totally disappeared, but the palm branch is still to be seen engraved on several of the tombs in the same place. The neighbouring catacomb of St. Agatha contains an interesting crypt, in which mass is still said once a year on the anniversary of the festival of the saint. Its rock walls are decorated with much-decayed frescoes representing St. Agatha, St. Lucia, St. Venera, the Virgin, St. Anthony, St. Blaise, etc. Mrs. Jameson describes the place as follows:—'Among the remains of art relative to St. Agatha may be mentioned the subterranean chapel at Malta. According to a tradition of the island, the ground once belonged to her family. It is carved out of the living rock, and the walls covered with frescoes, containing at least twenty-four figures, nearly life-size, most of them have peeled off the surface, but those which remain are of extraordinary beauty. The style is that of the early Tuscan school; the date about the middle of the fifteenth century, (*Sacred and Legendary Art*, vol. ii. p. 233-234).

A similar type of fresco exists in the crypt of the

catacomb of St. Venera, and was also noticed in that of St. Cataldus in Abela's time. In the quaint little catacomb of 'L'Abbatia,' which lies in the side of a rock terrace outside Città Vecchia, there is a fairly well preserved fresco of the Crucifixion and the Annunciation. In the centre is the figure of Christ on the cross, on one arm of which is the word VIKTOR, and on the other MORTIS. To the right of the cross stands the figure of a woman, with the letters MAT. On her right is a figure with the words ANGELUS GABRIEL. To the left of the cross stands a figure with the letters (I)OH, and to the left of this figure a woman, with the letters DOM.

Traces of other frescoes are visible in the place. Near that just described, a ship and a palm branch are cut in the wall, and there are eight crosses on the adjacent pillars. Dr. Caruana attributes the origin of this catacomb to about the beginning of the fifth century A.D. The paintings mentioned above may be taken as proving, not only that these sites were venerated as holy places in the middle of the fifteenth century, but the then existence of a Christian tradition of a much earlier date in connexion with them.

5. The objects found in the catacombs of Città Vecchia have been chiefly small clay lamps of the same primitive form as those found in Rome, Pompeii, Syracuse, and elsewhere. Excellent specimens of them may be seen in the museum at Valletta and in the Roman house at Città Vecchia. They bear sometimes the image of a fish, sometimes of a peacock or a stag, sometimes a simple cross, and sometimes the monogram XP—all well-known Christian symbols.

6. The names which the catacombs of Città Vecchia bear are all ecclesiastical ones. Even if these titles are only mediæval, the fact that they were then named after various Christian saints points to their already having been regarded as sacred spots, which were linked, in the minds of the inhabitants, with the early Christian history of the locality. The earliest recorded bishop of Malta is Acacius, who attended the Council of Chalcedon in 451 A.D. There is, however, no reason to doubt the possibility of Christianity having gained a footing in the island considerably before that date, nor that there may have been local confessors there who shared in the sufferings of their fellow-believers in other parts of the Roman Empire during the Decian persecution of A.D. 250. For aught that is known

to the contrary, there may have been a Christian community in Malta as early as the period of Antoninus, 138–161 A.D., or even earlier. What the local tradition asserts with regard to a sojourn in the island by St. Venera of Marseilles (fl. 143 A.D.) and St. Agatha of Catania (fl. 249 A.D.) may have a foundation in fact: some Gallican or Sicilian Christians may have fled to the comparatively sequestered Melita in these days of trouble, and ‘spoken the word’ there with abiding effect. Native legend, indeed, goes farther, and boldly claims St. Paul himself as the first preacher, and Publius as the first bishop, in Malta, in spite of the complete silence of the narrative in the Book of Acts regarding any direct evangelizing or conversions in connexion with the apostle’s stay in the island. In the matter of local catacombs, one is on firmer ground, with some tangible evidence and positive data to go by. It is not likely that all memory and knowledge of the places where their forefathers had first worshipped Christ and were laid to sleep in His name would be completely lost among a population proud of their island’s accidental connexion with St. Paul, and of the mention of it in one of the N.T. books, and

so tenacious of their Christianity that even the long Saracen occupation of Malta from 870 to 1090 A.D. did not convert them into Mohammedans. It was probably during that period that the local Christian monuments were pillaged and defaced by the Arab conquerors, who appear to have kept the natives of the island in a state of servitude, and to have been heartily hated by them.

One thing may be regarded as certain, namely, that the ancient town of Città Vecchia represents the primitive centre of Christianity in Malta, and that two at least of its present ecclesiastical sites—that of the Cathedral and that of the parish Church of St. Paul—are very closely connected with the early days of Christian faith there. It is around the latter that the catacombs of Città Vecchia cluster most closely.

Thus, taking all the facts into consideration, we may reasonably conclude that, like those elsewhere, the catacombs at Malta are of Christian origin. Their existence is an additional proof of how Christianity percolated even to small outlying spots in the Roman Empire, and sometimes suffered the same vicissitudes in these as in more important places.

The Original Book of Deuteronomy.

BY REV. J. A. SELBIE, D.D., MARYCULTER, ABERDEEN.

THE PURPOSE of the present paper is to give a general account and estimate of an important work that has been recently published on the above subject. In this book, whose title is given below,¹ there are no doubt embodied the results of years of study and thought. Mr. Cullen argues very ably in support of a somewhat novel theory.

The Book of Deuteronomy, it has long been felt, is in many ways the key to the Hexateuch. By universal admission it was this book in some form that was read before king Josiah, and that formed the basis of his reforms. It is pretty generally admitted, moreover, that however much of older material it contained, Josiah’s law-book

was of recent origin, having been composed either in his own reign or in that of Manasseh. There is more diversity of opinion on the question of the original dimensions of the book. Many critics follow Wellhausen in holding that chapters 12–26 are the kernel of the present Book of Deuteronomy and were originally the whole, and that chapters 5–11 and 1–4 were subsequently prefixed by way of prefaces to new editions. Others, of whom Kuenen and Driver may be named as representatives, decline to separate 5–11 from 12–26, regarding chapters 5–26, along with chapter 28, as substantially a unity, and as having constituted the book found by Hilkiah. They differ somewhat as to the origin of the other chapters in the present Book of Deuteronomy.

Now, Mr. Cullen emphasizes the fact that his inquiry in the work before us is strictly limited to

¹ *The Book of the Covenant in Moab: A Critical Inquiry into the Original Form of Deuteronomy.* By John Cullen, M.A., D.Sc. Glasgow: James Maclehose & Sons. Price 5s. net.

the one question of the *literary* composition of Deuteronomy. 'It does not include any attempt to expound the teaching of the book as a whole, or to investigate the question of its date, or to describe its relations to the rest of the Hexateuch.' We may remark, however, that Mr. Cullen has not been able to avoid doing, and doing well, some of these other things. Assuming, then, the ordinary critical position that in Deuteronomy we have the literary precipitate of a religious movement under Josiah, he sets himself to deal with the question, 'Is it possible to determine what part or parts of it constituted the pioneer document of this movement, and from the point of view thus attained to give an intelligible account of the subsequent process of growth by which the book reached its present condition?' Mr. Cullen himself would be the last to claim that he has given the final answer to this question, but it will be admitted by those who have kept in touch with Deuteronomic problems that his book is a notable contribution to the literature, and will materially help the solution of those problems.

It is particularly in his view of chapters 5-11 that the distinctiveness of Mr. Cullen's position shows itself. To begin with, he differs *in toto* from those who look upon these chapters as introductory to chapters 12-26, which, with their requirement of a *central sanctuary*, are supposed to form the kernel of Deuteronomy. He argues that the first-named group of chapters contain no indications that they are an *introduction*, but much the other way. Moreover, he finds in the emphasis they lay upon the exclusive *object* of worship, namely, Jahweh, an element far superior in importance to the emphasis laid in chapters 12-26 upon the *place* of worship, namely, Jerusalem. Is not the prescription regarding the *place* likely to have come in afterwards as a means of securing the better fulfilment of Israel's duty to the *object* of their worship? Mr. Cullen, by patient examination, discovers that the essential element in the original Deuteronomy was the idea of a Covenant made with Israel in the plains of Moab. This Covenant and the 'Commandment' (*mizvah*) underlying it he discovers in chapters 5-11 (with the additional passages to be mentioned presently); whereas the 'Law' (*tōrah*) makes up chapters 12-26. *After the Book of the Covenant in Moab had been a short time in existence*, the Book of the Law (Dt 12-26) was published, he holds, at

first separately and as a self-contained whole. It is on the establishing of this distinction between *mizvah* and *tōrah*, 'Commandment' and 'Law,' 'Covenant' and 'Legal Code,' that Mr. Cullen spends his strength. Josiah's reforms were, according to him, inaugurated with the publication of the Book of the Covenant; their subsequent progress, which Mr. Cullen believes to have been slower than is sometimes supposed, was aided and regulated by the *after* publication of the Book of the Law.

Here we may pause to say that Mr. Cullen appears to us to score heavily against those who make Dt 5-11 an *after* introduction, or *merely* an introduction to 12-26, but not to touch seriously the position of those who regard 5-26 as a unity all dating from the same period, and not to be divided up into introduction and kernel.

But Mr. Cullen has a much more detailed account to give, both of the original Deuteronomy and of the Book of the Law. For reasons, which cannot be stated here, he finds the real commencement of the Book of the Covenant in Dt 29¹⁻¹⁴ [Heb 28⁶⁹-29¹⁸], for which 5^{1st} (the Decalogue having been wanting in the original book) was afterwards substituted. Other parts of the present book are drawn by Mr. Cullen (always for reasons assigned) from the position they now occupy, and placed where he tells us they stood at first. Even a passage from Exodus (24⁴⁻⁸) finds a place in the original Book of the Covenant. Now, it is easy to indulge in cheap sarcasm at such feats in the way of piecing together ancient documents or parts of them. We have no sympathy with such a disposition, which is due largely to laziness and largely to imperfect knowledge. All the same, we cannot help confessing that, as we read Mr. Cullen's book, we have every now and then the feeling that he is just a little too skilful in finding the bits of the puzzle and putting them together; and that his explanations of how the *dissecta membra* came to occupy their present places are almost too plausible to be true. Not a few will feel that it is a thousand pities that men were not content to leave the original Book of Deuteronomy alone, and the Law-book alone, instead of publishing, as Mr. Cullen tells us they did, a combined edition of the *mizvah* and the *tōrah*, and supplementing this by the 'Decalogue edition' and the 'Minatory edition.' Their editorial efforts have not been a success, and they have laid a heavy burden on

modern scholars who seek to restore the original. What Mr. Cullen has given us is an immense improvement on the present Book of Deuteronomy (see his three appendixes, containing the Book of the Covenant in Moab *in extenso*, the original environment of the Law-book, and an outline of the first combined edition). The logical connexion, the consistency, the harmony of the different parts are faultless. Yet somehow we are not satisfied. We have a pretty strong conviction that we shall never know so exactly as is here laid down what were the original contents of Deuteronomy. It is comparatively easy to separate off exilic and post-exilic additions, and to detect the hand of the P redactor. Here Mr. Cullen's conclusions are perfectly reliable, but we cannot follow him entirely when he rearranges the Book of the Covenant in Moab thus—

Dt 28⁶⁹⁻²⁹ 5² 4^{10-16a, 19-26} 5²⁹⁻⁸¹⁸ 26 8¹⁹⁻⁹⁶ 10¹²⁻²¹ 27^{1b},
 3b, -4a, 5-7 11⁸⁻²⁸ 28^{1a}, 2a, 7-14, 15, 20-25a, 43-45 30¹¹⁻²⁰, Ex 24⁴⁻⁸,
 Dt 32⁴⁵⁻⁴⁷.

All the different constituents of this scheme are arrived at by a process of close reasoning; but it is this very logical, mathematical exactness that awakens our suspicions. It is not the way of ancient Hebrew writing to lend itself to such exactness. Diffuseness, repetition; ill arrangement of their material, overlappings, and even real or apparent inconsistencies are far from rare, either in the Old Testament or the New. The present Book of Deuteronomy is disappointingly diffuse and ill arranged, but so are the Pauline Epistles. In both instances world-wide effects have been produced by the contents, although the authors were such poor masters of method. A modern writer, using St. Paul's own language and simply rearranging it, could greatly improve upon the apostle's work as far as order and clearness are concerned. But the fact remains that the present arrangement is the original one. Why should it be otherwise in Deuteronomy? The diffuseness and repetitions and want of system in the book are a direct temptation to a clear logical mind like that of Mr. Cullen. Yet the scheme he imposes on the book is, we are persuaded, to a large extent arbitrary. Whatever may be the case with chapters 1-4 and with some of the chapters at the end of the book, we see no reason why 5-26, with chapter 28, should not have been a unity from the first, and have come down to us in *substantially* their original form and arrangement.

We may add one or two minor criticisms. We are not sure that Mr. Cullen is quite just in his appreciation (p. 2 f.) of the attempts of 'Staerk & Steuernagel' [why this symbolism, which suggests a limited liability company trading under these two names?] to carry out an analysis of the sources of Deuteronomy upon the ground of the distinction in the use of the 2nd person singular and the 2nd person plural, when the subject of address is the nation. It may be that both Staerk and Steuernagel have used this key to open locks for which it was never intended, but to speak of it as 'a trifling item of literary technique,' as Mr. Cullen does, is surely going too far. Allowance must no doubt be made for the tendency of redactors to secure uniformity by smoothing out the above distinction, and also for a reasonable licence to the original writer in the way of passing from the singular to the plural pronoun, and *vice versa*; but with these and similar reservations there is no reason why the clue followed by Staerk and Steuernagel should not be as reliable as that supplied by the varying use of 'Jahweh' and 'Elohim.'

The argument (p. 16 ff.) that the narrative of 2 K 23 is 'a telescoped account of a series of reforms, stretching, it may be, over a period of some years, a mixing together of things which were done at different times and possibly in a different order,' is perhaps a little forced.

We are not inclined to allow even the slight weight he himself claims for it, to Mr. Cullen's argument (p. 19 f.) from Jer 7^{21f}: 'I spake not unto your fathers, nor commanded them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning the matter of burnt-offerings or sacrifices,' etc. It was in an evil hour that the prophet penned these verses. Like figures, they may be used to prove anything. We might apply to them the saying regarding Scripture in general—

Hic liber est in quo quaerit sua dogmata quisque,
 Invenit et pariter dogmata quisque sua.

On the other hand, the language of Jer 11^{1ff}, with its references to a 'covenant,' goes a long way towards justifying Mr. Cullen in placing Dt 28⁶⁹⁻²⁹ 13 at the head of the supposed original 'Book of the Covenant in Moab,' or, as we prefer to say, at the head of the larger book which we believe to have existed from the first. There is much to say, of course, in favour of the view that the Decalogue now found in Dt 5 was wanting at first.

The principal merits of Mr. Cullen's book appear to us to be two. He has greatly strengthened the position of those who find it impossible to hold that Dt 5-11 was written after 12-26 and as an introduction to these chapters; and he has done good service in exposing the over-emphasis so often laid on the *centralizing of the worship*, as if this were practically the one important point in the book, to the neglect of the great truth of the

exclusive claims of Jahweh, as embodied in the Shêma'. Further, there are many particular points on which Mr. Cullen throws light, especially from the linguistic and exegetical points of view. Even those who cannot assent to some of his conclusions in the sphere of literary criticism, will readily pay their tribute of admiration to the patient argument and accurate scholarship of Mr. Cullen's book.

Point and Illustration.

ONE of the strangest things in the history of Scotland is the way in which the people have persisted in believing in the Covenanters. They have read Sir Walter Scott. They have him in every home; they laugh over his Ephraim Macbriar and his Habakkuk Mucklewrath. They even read a very little of Mr. Andrew Lang and Mr. J. H. Millar. But they never cease to believe in the Covenanters.

A book has been published by Mr. Melrose which the people of Scotland will enjoy. It is written by the Rev. Alexander Smellie. It is *The Men of the Covenant* (7s. 6d. net). The book is illustrated, and the people like illustrated books; we do not say that they will not at first be startled at the primitive simplicity of these illustrations, for they have forgotten how their fathers loved to make portraits of one another. But the book does not need its illustrations. It is the book of the Covenanters for the people, and the people will read it.

Take the words which open the chapter on Alexander Peden—'Puir Auld Sandy' the title of the chapter is. Or best of all take a little paragraph of description. Its interest is greater where it lies. But it will do to say that it refers to Donald Cargill and the Earl of Rothes, who were comrades at St. Andrews University, and both signed the Solemn League and Covenant. But Rothes took to profligacy and drunkenness, and he 'went out into the night,' crying for such as Cargill, his own ministers being 'good to live with but not to die with'; while the evening after, Cargill witnessed a good confession at the 'Mercat Cross':

High up in the Alps are two small lakes, which lie in such proximity that it is possible to throw a stone from one to the

other. The one is Lago Bianco, the White Loch, because its waters are light green in their colour; its neighbour is Lago Nero, or the Black Loch, for its appearance is gloomy and forbidding. But, although they are so close, they are on different inclines of the watershed. Lago Bianco sends its overflow to the Adriatic, while Lago Nero is connected with the Black Sea. We look at the one, and think about the sunshine of Italy; at the other, and are transported to the wintry Crimea. So men whose lives begin in intimate union, with the same aspirations and opportunities, pursue their sundered courses, 'breaker and builder of the eternal law'—

One to lone darkness and the frozen tide,
One to the crystal sea.

Probation.—'In no part of his solemnizing and overawing book does Butler more solemnize and overawe his readers than in his chapter on probation. "The conception," says Canon Spooner, "which in these chapters Butler has elaborated, of our present life being a period of probation for a future state of existence, has probably affected English thought more than any other part of the *Analogy*." This life is not an end in itself and to itself; this life is meaningless and purposeless, it is a maze and a mystery, it is absolutely without explanation or justification to Butler unless it is the ordained entrance to another life which is to be the completion and the compensation of this life. But, then, grant that this present life is but the schoolroom and the practising-ground to another life, and what a grandeur straightway invests this life! What a holy fear, and what a holy hope, thenceforward take possession of the heart of the probationer of immortality!'

That is from Dr. Whyte's new book. Its title is *Bishop Butler, an Appreciation, with the best*

Passages of his Writings selected and arranged (Oliphant; 3s. 6d.). We have chosen one of the 'best passages' of Dr. Whyte. They are just as good as Butler's, and sometimes more intimate and searching.

I love Jesus, but I hate God.—Messrs. Nisbet have published a remarkable—remarkably attractive and remarkably provoking—autobiography under the title of *The Unselfishness of God and How I discovered it*. It is written by Mrs. Pearsall Smith. Mrs. Smith's Quaker teachers when she was a girl taught that God was terror, not that God was love, and she gives this story of a young companion's experience:

A friend of mine told me that her childhood was passed in a perfect terror of God. Her idea of Him was that He was a cruel giant with an awful 'Eye' which could see everything, and that was always spying upon her. She said she would creep into bed at night with the dreadful feeling that even in the dark the 'Eye of God' was upon her, and would lie with the bed covers over her head, saying to herself in an agonized whisper, 'What shall I do? Oh, what *shall* I do? Even my mother cannot save me from God!'

One night her mother heard the poor little despairing cry, and sitting down beside the bed, told her that God was not a dreadful tyrant to be afraid of, but was just like Jesus. My friend said she had always loved the stories about Jesus, and when she heard that God was like Him, it took away her fear of God forever. And when she went to bed that night she fairly laughed out loud at the thought that such a dear kind Eye was watching over her.

This little child had got a sight of God 'in the face of Jesus Christ,' and it brought rest to her soul.

Mrs. Pearsall Smith learned by and by that God did *not* do everything for His own glory, but for our good; and then she went on to rest on God's will in a way that compels us to say that her book is not only an attractive but a provoking and perverse book. For example she says:

The first time I had a practical insight into this blessedness of the will of God was three days after the birth of a darling little baby girl. My nurse had been suddenly taken ill, and we had been forced to get in a strange nurse, whose looks I did not like much. It was winter time, and, on the first evening of her arrival, the nurse, after settling me in for the night, sat down close to the fire, taking my darling baby on her knees. Pretty soon she fell sound asleep, and I was awakened by her snores to see the baby lying perilously near the fire on her slanting lap, while her head nodded over it in what seemed like a drunken slumber. I tried to waken her, but in vain. I could make no one hear, and I knew that to get out of bed might seriously injure me. My anxiety was so overpowering that I sat up in bed and was trying to rise, when these words flashed into my mind: 'I

run no risks, for come what will Thou always hast Thy way.' And with it came a conviction that my baby could not run any risks, for she was safe in God's care. With a sense of infinite peace my head fell back on my pillow, and my soul sank back on the sweet will of God.

An Affair of Honour.—The Rev. John Kelman, M.A., of Edinburgh, whose *Stevenson* has given him name and fame of late, has just published a thin volume (through Messrs. Oliphant; 1s. net) of eight short chapters, to which he has given the uncommittal title of *Honour towards God*.

'Put in one sentence, the subject of the book is God's trust in man. To some this may seem a reversal of the true order. Is not man's trust in God the right way to put it? No; it is God's trust in man that is intended here.' That is one sentence. We shall give more. 'In these and many other instances we see life regarded as an affair of honour, in which all privilege is an opportunity not for indulgence but for service.' Again: 'That is to say, that God has made history by trusting men, and history is but the record of His trust.' And last: 'A work had to be done, a truth to be thought out, a message to be delivered. And the noblest Christian men and women of each age and community have thus understood their life and times. The work they had to do, the battles which they fought, the truths which they proclaimed—each of these came to them as a matter for which God relied on them.'

The Rev. John Fitzpatrick, O.M.T., has gathered a thick volume of *Characteristics from the Writings of Father Faber* (Washbourne; 5s.). They are mostly rather long for quotation, and yet there is no other way. Here is a short and good one:

The Magnet of Souls.—The Blessed Sacrament is the magnet of souls. There is a mutual attraction between Jesus and the souls of men. Mary drew Him down from heaven. Our nature attracted Him rather than the nature of angels. Our misery caused him to stoop to our lowness. Even our sins had a sort of attraction for the abundance of His mercy and the predilection of His grace. Our repentance wins Him to us. Our love makes earth a paradise to Him, and our souls lure Him, as gold lures the miser, with irresistible fascination. This is the attraction on our side. On the other hand, He draws us to Himself by grace, by example, by power, by lovingness, by beauty, by pardon, and above all by the Blessed Sacrament. Everyone who has had anything to do with ministering to souls has seen the power which Jesus has. Talent is not needed. Eloquence

is comparatively unattractive. Learning is often beside the mark. Controversy for the most part repels. But the simple preaching of Jesus Christ and Him crucified will collect a congregation, fill a church, crowd the confessionals, furnish the altar-rail, and solemnize a feast when nothing else will do so. There is not a power on earth to be compared to the simple and unadorned preaching of the gospel.

Studies in the Art of Illustration, by Amos R. Wells (Revell; 3s. 6d. net), promises well, but it drops far behind its promise. Mr. Wells is too wordy. Did he set out to make a great book with the material of a very small one? Still, there are ideas. Here are two illustrations—much condensed in the wording. Is the second one true?

A Christian in Uniform.—Do you remember when Colonel Waring put the New York force of street-cleaners in white uniforms? It is now recognized by all that the efficiency of those workers was vastly increased by this step. The whiteness of their suits was a reminder of their beautiful errand of cleanliness. It was also an emblem to them of the great organization which they must not disgrace. The uniform stood also for authority. Uniforms have worked

wonders for railway conductors, policemen, volunteers, the Salvation Army, hospital nurses, and students. I wonder if you see what I am driving at. It is this: Join the Church: become a Christian in uniform.

He that doeth the Will.—Ask some one to shut his eyes. Take a pair of sharp-pointed scissors, open them so that the tips are about a third of an inch apart, and touch your friend's forehead with them, asking him whether both tips are touching him or only one. He will say, 'Only one.' Keeping the scissors the same, touch the lips or the chin. Now your friend will say, 'Two.' If you experiment on the middle of the back, you will find that you must hold the tips of the scissors two and a half inches apart, if you want to feel them as more than one; the forefingers, on the other hand, tell them apart when only separated one-twelfth of an inch, and the delicate tongue when one-twenty-fourth of an inch is between them. Surely, when I ask you how you feel, you might with propriety respond, 'What part of me?'

What is the cause of this great difference in sensitiveness? Practice, and nothing else. The easiest and surest way to grow hardened to any duty is simply to leave it alone! And if you want to grow skilful in a virtue, practise it. By and by your spiritual touch will become more delicate, and yours will be the execution of a master.

The Old Testament in Teaching and Preaching.

AS AFFECTED BY THE MORE ASSURED RESULTS OF RESEARCH.

BY THE RIGHT REV. HERBERT EDWARD RYLE, D.D., BISHOP OF WINCHESTER.

IN this title distinction is rightly drawn between the work of the teacher and the work of the preacher. Often happily, sometimes unhappily, blended, their special functions are not absolutely identical. The teacher can spoil his work by preaching; the preacher improve his by teaching.

On the present occasion we leave on one side disputable problems. We assume that certain results of research in Old Testament study have been unquestionably attained. What is to be their effect upon the duties of preacher and teacher? I will take the preacher first.

The assured results are of a literary and historical character. They are not subjects which the preacher ordinarily, or even necessarily, handles. The sermon is not a literary lecture. Undoubtedly the preacher must be—is called to be—above all things a student of the Word of God; and by all means let him be intensely interested in its literary aspects; yes, let him become fascinated by archaeological inquiry, by Assyrian and Egyptian re-

searches, by literary criticism. It will all help, when studied in due proportion, to widen the human interest and to cultivate the intellectual powers. But the pulpit is not the lecturer's desk. The preacher is set apart to preach the Word of God; and, though all truth is comprehended in that phrase, he is primarily the preacher of a spiritual message. He declares the gospel of Jesus Christ. His first duty is concerned with the words of Eternal Life.

Nevertheless, his sermon on the Old Testament ought to be based on sound interpretation. The scholarly knowledge of the text is an indispensable aid for any departure from the beaten path of homiletic discourse. The scientific *data* of his exegesis are out of place in the sermon itself. They should remain below the surface—a solid sub-structure—not obtruded upon the view. Literary explanations or historical prefaces, attempted for the purpose of illuminating the situation represented in the text or of deepening the human

interest, need to be simple, vivid, and constructive—not complicated, not controversial, not merely negative. It is a mistake to bewilder the minds of an audience, which rarely includes many special students, with problems in which no vital interest is taken, and for the consideration of which little or no previous training can be assumed.

The preacher on the Old Testament, therefore, is occupied with spiritual, doctrinal, moral, and practical questions—not with the results of research. For him as a pastor and spiritual guide the Old Testament contains the Holy Scriptures as they were used for the same purpose by our Lord and His apostles. The question for him to consider is not how they came into being, but what they are and what their divine message is, and how best it can be transmitted to the hearts of men and women. In the words of my friend and teacher, Bishop Westcott, 'The Old Testament substantially as we have it was the Bible of the Lord and the apostles'; and now, as then, those Scriptures 'are able to make men wise unto salvation'; now, as then, 'are profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction which is in righteousness.'

Our Lord's own use of the Old Testament Scriptures should be our continual reminder and inspiration for our practical guidance. It reveals to us the slight and superficial character of our endeavours to employ the Old Testament for spiritual instruction and moral teaching. It rebukes us for our scanty knowledge of its contents, our hasty despair to profit by them, our cowardly retreat into mere questions of antiquity or history and geography as an easy substitute for the deeper significance which is to be sought, and which the Lord always found in the sacred writings.

Let us, therefore, rest assured of the wealth of material for the preacher's use which remains unaffected by the results of recent researches into the Old Testament. Perhaps our very familiarity, or possibly our ignorance, prevents us from realizing the depth and variety of the religious teaching contained in the Bible of the Jewish Church, and enforced in so many ways in prose and poetry, in narrative and exhortation, in proverb and parable. It infinitely transcended the best gifts of Greece and Rome in spiritual power and devotional purity. There stand out the great fundamental principles of religious thought and life; that there is a God, that He is One; that He is a spiritual Being; that

He made the Universe; that He made man in His own image and likeness; that man can hear His word and hold communion with Him; that the world is governed by the law of God's righteousness and love; that man is made to love God and to love his neighbour.

But apart from these vast primary subjects of theology—which perhaps we wrongly assume no longer require enforcing from the pulpit in terms appropriate to the thought of our own day—there are aspects of theological inquiry in Old Testament study which have been in a striking measure modified by modern research.

1. *The Theology of the Old Testament.*—We see now much more clearly than we did a century ago that the theology of the Old Testament must be handled in a strictly historical method. The Old Testament does not anticipate the New. The typology and allegorical interpretations in which the Fathers and Schoolmen rejoiced, failed in accurate exegesis because they lacked the means of historical access to the mind of the writers. The bud is not the full flower; the Old Testament may contain premonitions and supply illustrations of distinctive New Testament teaching. We must not look for proofs, e.g., of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, or of the Resurrection, which were only revealed to us in and through the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ.

The theology of the Old Testament is historically progressive. It rests upon the experiences of Israel's national life, and the revelation of the Divine Nature and Will is continuously interpreted by the men moved by the Holy Spirit. It is a clearly recognized advance from knowledge to knowledge, from grace to grace. The conceptions of the nature of God, of sin, of holiness, of a life to come, grow in distinctness with the progress of the revelation. And the progress of theological thought is being better understood in the light of the more assured results of research into the character and history of the books.

2. *The Morality of the Old Testament.*—The old stumbling-block caused by this subject has practically been removed. The morality of the Old Testament writers is seen, in the light of modern research, as presenting no final or perfect standard. If it is imperfect, it is progressive; it corresponds to the limitations of the time. This is understood in our day; it was not understood by our forefathers. The possession of slaves and the practice

of slavery, the practice of polygamy, retaliatory murder, wars of extermination against the heathen, imprecatory denunciations,—such things have been justified by appeals to the Old Testament. We have learned a better lesson from our studies; and we know it as an assured result that these things faithfully reflect the imperfect yet ever progressive condition of Israelite morality, through which, or in spite of which, it pleased God that the advance should continually be made towards the higher revelation of God's wisdom and love for men. Moreover, a far wider field of moral teaching has been obtained by our better knowledge of the prophetic writings. The prophets live for us in a degree unknown to former generations. In an age when social problems press most urgently, the preacher of Christ is drawing fresh inspirations from the prophets of Israel; and, if for purposes of edification, much of the Jewish law seems 'nigh unto vanishing away,' much in the writings of the prophets has by way of compensation revived with a new life.

3. *Messianic Teaching.*—Many passages that our forefathers could only interpret as predictions of the personal Messiah are now seen to possess a primary reference to contemporary personages or events, and to admit only in a secondary sense of application to the expectation of the Messiah. But if less full of personal prediction, the prophets are found to testify more abundantly to the general Messianic idea. It embraced the whole nation. The hope of redemption and of the kingdom of God filled the thoughts of the faithful. 'The spirit of Christ in the Old Testament,' says my friend, George Adam Smith, 'is not confined to its human heroes and ideals. The length and the breadth, the height and the depth of it, belong to the Old Testament's revelation of God Himself.'

4. *The Divine Revelation.*—Lastly, the belief in a Divine Revelation through Israel is not shaken by modern research. Naturalistic explanations prove wholly inadequate to account for the phenomena. The history of Israel remains unique and unparalleled. To that history the Scriptures of the Old Testament correspond. The Revelation of the Divine Nature and Purpose comes to us through the medium of a unique record, in harmony with the actual experience of national life.

Turn we now to the results which more especially affect the teacher. They are literary and historical. An improved knowledge of the literature and

history, if it has profoundly modified our previous views, has come to the relief of the teacher and the apologist. It has dissipated many doubts; it has caused the abandonment of many false and indefensible positions. I can instance but one or two.

(1) *Questions of Physical Science.*—The old difficulties arising from the futile attempts to reconcile the Genesis account of the Creation and the Flood with the rapid advance of modern scientific knowledge have been removed by modern research. We now know that there existed in the Semitic nations of Western Asia a primitive tradition concerning the beginning of the universe and concerning a great flood. The Genesis account gives the Hebrew version, with which there has been found in fairly close agreement an Assyrian version written in the cuneiform character. Long before Moses, and probably long before Abraham, this tradition of the Cosmogony was well known. The Genesis account tells the famous story in the terms, not of the polytheism or superstition which pervade the Babylonian version, but of the pure Israelite faith in Jehovah. The first pages of our Bible teach neither accurate science nor literal history. But in the simple outlines of the inimitable narrative which reproduces the popular tradition it laid deep the foundations of the first principles of all religion—no primer of science, but the very protevangelium of the Word of God.

(2) *History.*—The historical questions raised by the narrative books of the Old Testament must be answered on their own merits. The early traditions of the nomadic state lead up to the more connected history of the monarchical period. Some points are confirmed and others rendered doubtful by Assyrian study. The Israelite writings are primarily religious in purpose. They furnish the historian with materials for history rather than with history itself. They reproduce a series of incidents selected for the most part for their significance, whether historical or symbolical, in the religious discipline of the people.

The character of the Divine Revelation has not relieved us of any single task or duty in the work of intellectual research. These writings are for our learning in spiritual things. They are not to save us trouble in the human study of literature. And the determination of what is literal history, what allegorical and the like, is not attained by any casual recognition of their inspired character.

'The biblical critic approaches the Scriptures from their literary side by the same methods as he would approach any other ancient writings, if with more scrupulous care and a more present sense of his responsibility' (Westcott).

(3) *Comparative Religion*.—This study has revealed to us the somewhat startling fact that the Israelite worship, its rites and institutions, its sacrificial system, its distinctions of clean and unclean, stood in close resemblance to the worship of other Semitic races. It can no longer be claimed that the externals of the Israelite religion present an absolutely unique feature in ancient religious life. 'The aim of the Hebrew legislation was not so much to create a new system as to give a new significance to that which had already long existed among Semitic races, and to lay the foundation of a higher symbolism leading to a more spiritual worship.'

(4) *Literary Criticism*.—It is under this head that the greatest change of view—and probably the one of most significance—has taken place. The old view assumed that each book was written by one eminent author, until the series was complete and the whole collection was revised by Ezra. That view—so simple and yet so mechanical—was devoid of literary evidence. The books of the Pentateuch and the other narrative books are shown to possess writings of very different style, and to be composite in structure. Some, like Ecclesiastes, Esther, and Daniel, are shown by their language to belong to the latest stage of classical Hebrew.

The compilatory origin of many of the books explains the presence of many minor discrepancies, duplications, and contradictions, for which previously no satisfactory account had been obtained. The laws, which present three or four groupings derived from different periods, are referred back to the first great legislator, Moses, with whose name and work are bound up the foundations of Israelite constitution. The name of David, the sweet Psalmist, is employed in the same way to embrace

many poetical writings of quite uncertain date; while the names of Solomon and of Isaiah were popularly attached to writings that were collected with the Proverbs of Solomon and the prophecies of Isaiah.

(5) *The Jewish Canon of Scripture*.—The collection of the sacred books and their recognition as an authoritative canon was a gradual process, which offers points of comparison with the collection of the New Testament writings. This gradual process seems to have been based on popular religious usage. In the time of our Lord some books, like Esther and Ecclesiastes, were still viewed with suspicion by many Rabbinic teachers. The gradual historic process at the formation of the canon is not without its instructive features. Each book had its own significance and value; each bore its part in the training of the Jewish Church and in the varied preparation for the coming of the Messiah. But the books are neither homogeneous nor equal in value and power; the attempt to regard them as such breaks down. The results of historical inquiry confirm the verdict of common-sense.

The books of the Old Testament have gained in vividness of interest as they have been shown to be more true to history. They may be thought less perfect in accuracy, less encyclopædic in value; but they are seen to correspond more faithfully to the life of Israel. Nor does the fact that they were not exempt from the ordinary processes of origin and composition impair the substantive value of their mission.

They remain the greatest religious literature of any people of the history of the world. Their light was not the true Light, but it heralded the coming of the true Light of the World. Closely as we scrutinize its appearance, and minutely analyze its component parts, we shall not dim its brightness, nor diminish the wonder of its witness; nay, nor be losers by one ray of its joy and consolation, as lone in the dark firmament of the ancient world it hangs over the Inn of Bethlehem.

A Month's Sermons.

You can never have too much of a good thing, and there are good sermons. There are far more good sermons than bad. But there are so many sermons published that they have to be very good indeed to be agreeable. This month we know not how many volumes of sermons have been published; we only know that seven-and-twenty volumes have reached us for review. The number is great, and there are disappointments; but so rich is the thought and so appropriate its expression in here a volume and there a volume, that if no department of the literature of the month has cost us more, none has given us more pleasure. Were we to place the volumes in an ascending scale of worth, we should begin with Dr. Louis Albert Banks and end with Dr. A. B. Davidson. But it will be safer to take them in their alphabetical order.

ON THE TRAIL OF MOSES.—*Funk & Wagnall's*; 6s.

The title is terrible. We read on the title-page 'A Series of Revival Sermons,' and shudder. Why should the revival of religion be associated with the decay of the English language? Dr. Louis Albert Banks is evidently in earnest; his publishers, too, must find him a good asset, for they have published several volumes of his sermons; but he does not preach to publish, and he should not mistake his calling. Take the anecdotes. In the sense of the preacher's earnestness and in the rush of the preacher's words, they will pass and even make their impression. But they are not true. You cannot read them and retain your self-respect.

THE DARKNESS WHERE GOD IS.—*Stockwell*; 2s. 6d. net.

The author of this ugly volume is the Rev. R. Baldwin Brindley of Croydon. He has probably no responsibility for its ugliness. The sermons, too, have more strength than beauty, but there is beauty in their strength. The first has a striking text—'The thick darkness where God was' (Ex 20²¹)—not so often preached as it might be. Think of the dark clouds that overhang our life—clouds of (1) mystery, (2) providence, (3) sorrow, (4) death; but think also that in the thick darkness is God Himself, the God and Father of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

OUR HERITAGE.—*Blackwood*; 2s. 6d. net.

Dr. Bruce's title is too vague. If it makes a definite suggestion to the mind, it is probably a wrong one. For his meaning is not our inheritance in Christ. He means, as his subtitle helps to indicate, our whole inheritance, individual, social, and religious. It is a course of scientific sermons. The science is bold and progressive. There is no fear of evolution. There is no scorn for any theory that can touch our thinking or warm our hearth. But the science that is only physical must not claim to be all in all. Dr. Bruce of Banff is too much of a social reformer to believe that man can live by matter only.

CHRIST AND PROGRESS.—*Revell*; 3s. 6d. net.

Dr. D. J. Burrell of New York has all the revival intensity of Dr. Louis Banks, but he uses king's English. He has all the audacity of epithet, but the epithets thrill you with their keen appropriateness. He uses anecdote, but he remembers that truth is stranger and more arresting than fiction. Here is an effective contrast. He ends one sermon with the words: 'We shall go to the Judgment, for better or for worse, with the Bible in our hands.' The practical lesson is that which was found written on the fly-leaf of Michael Bruce's Bible after his death—

'Tis very vain of me to boast
How small a price this Bible cost;
The Day of Judgment will make clear,
'Twas very cheap or very dear.

And then he begins the next sermon with the story of Brugsch's discovery of the royal mummies at Thebes, with their hampers of food and their covering of byssus inscribed with sentences from the Book of the Dead. They were laid to rest in hope of a blessed resurrection,—and the spade of the explorer gave it to them in the nineteenth century of the Christian era, the Book of the Dead doing no more for them than that.

CITY TEMPLE SERMONS.—*Hodder & Stoughton*; 6s.

When we read sermons like these—they are the Rev. R. J. Campbell's—we are compelled to see that it is not divinity that draws men to church but humanity. *Cur Deus Homo*? We know now why God had to become man. Mr. Campbell, in

one of these sermons, tells us that a dying woman said to her visitor, 'I can believe all you declare about Jesus Christ, but I don't believe in God.' No, God has to become man before we can believe in Him. And the secret of the draw of Mr. Campbell's sermons is that God is always a man in them. Quicquid agunt homines—what *men* are doing—and really nothing else gets at us. What God was doing in the man, Christ Jesus is doing still—that is Mr. Campbell's gospel, and that is the gospel that fills the City Temple.

THE FULNESS OF TIME.—*Maclehose.*

This country minister—the Rev. Joseph Conn, B.D., of Tillicoultry—believes that Scotch country folk are all theologians still. He handles his theology somewhat freely, especially the supernatural, but he is strong on the fact that man does not live by morality alone. What would happen if Mr. Conn were put into the City Temple pulpit? He would gather the Scotch folk out of all London? But he would scatter the English. Think of a sermon on the Personality of God; and he places it first in his volume. It is philosophical, psychological, and all the rest that modern theology covers.

MANHOOD'S MORNING.—*Vir Pub. Co.*; 4s. net.

A volume for young men, by a young American preacher, the Rev. Joseph Alfred Conwell, D.D. It is not properly a volume of sermons, for it leaves out Christ. It leaves out Christ except in so far as He is an example to young men. Its motto is, 'Because ye are strong.' It is an appeal to young men to make the most of their faculties and get on. Young men are not wrong, but they may go wrong, and Dr. Conwell warns them of that. That they may not go wrong they must—not believe—but do something, and Dr. Conwell tells them what to do.

WAITING UPON GOD.—*T. & T. Clark*; 6s.

The title of the first volume of sermons by the late Professor A. B. Davidson was *The Called of God*. Its contents revealed God's hand in the affairs of men and saints. This volume lets us see how men and saints respond to God. Why do we call it the best of all the volumes of sermons this month? Because the sermons it contains are nearest the sermons we should preach if we could. Because they have in them the humanity that

draws, the divinity that heals. Because they are a scholar's sermons, and the scholar (when the word is used as it should be) gets nearer to the truth than other men. Because—and this is the reason at last—Dr. Davidson's sermons seem ever to answer the question we are ever asking of all our preachers, 'Sir, we would see Jesus.' He does not drag Jesus in. Not even in Job's 'I know that my Redeemer liveth' is Jesus dragged in. Nor does he drag us into the presence of Jesus. The doors are shut, and He is suddenly with us; and though our sins are scarlet as preacher ever proclaimed them, His message is always, 'Peace be unto you.'

WITH THE LITTLE ONES.—*Marshall Brothers*; 2s. 6d.

E. M. Dewhurst—whether Mr., Mrs., or Miss, we cannot tell. Let us say Miss, for the whole soul goes out to the work of the infant class, and there are no home ties to take up the time. Besides the sermon, which is a children's concrete talk about the Unseen, there are prayers and hymns and questions—a complete children's service, worth lifting bodily.

THE HIDING OF HIS POWER.—*Stockwell*; 2s. net.

It needs some courage now to preach the old familiar texts. That is a bad sign. For the old texts have the best and most of the gospel in them. Perhaps a Methodist Free Church minister needs less courage for this than others. The Rev. Henry Fothergill gets his sermon easily out of the great familiar passages, and his congregation have never begged him to be more original.

A SCHOOL'S LIFE.—*Marshall Brothers*; 2s. 6d.

The sermons that are preached in the chapels of Eton and Harrow are considered fit for publication; but here is the headmaster of an ordinary public school (and he is not qualifying for a bishopric), who takes his duty to the boys and girls in his school on its religious side so seriously that he allows them to enjoy a school service once a week, and publishes his sermons. They will stand as models to all other schoolmasters, as models and as encouragement. They will even help to solve the educational difficulty. For this is what everybody desires, and nobody need desire more than this. The school is Keswick, and the headmaster's name is the Rev. Cecil Grant, M.A.

THE GLORIOUS COMPANY OF THE APOSTLES; THE MODEL PRAYER.—*Clarke*; 2s. net, each.

Both volumes are by the Rev. J. D. Jones, M.A., B.D., of Bournemouth. The sermons they contain are such as may be heard in hundreds of churches every Lord's Day; and the proof-reading is not what it ought to be. But the commonplace is what the people love; some of us fail as preachers out of sheer ability and originality.

FIFTY-TWO SUNDAYS WITH THE CHILDREN.—*Allenson*; 3s. 6d.

The Rev. James Learmont is one of our preachers to children. There are those who make more show round the children's sermon, and a little beating of drums is a good enough thing. But his matter is homely and instructive.

LAST SHEAVES.—*Hodder & Stoughton*.

This is the pathetic title which Dr. Maclaren has given to his latest volume of sermons. The title recalls some verses which run—

Few light and worthless, yet their trifling weight
Through all my frame a weary aching leaves,
For long I struggled with my hapless fate,
And stayed and toiled till it was dark and late,
Yet these are all my sheaves.

But the words do not fit this worker. Few have been so blest to find their work, to do it, and to be honoured in it. Nor are these last sheaves less rich and nourishing than any that have been gathered before them.

THE TOUCH OF GOD.—*S. C. Brown*; 3s. 6d.

It is Dr. Macmillan's last. He had not even passed them for the press when 'God's finger touched him and he slept.' They reach us as from the Unseen. And so, surely we say, there are 'daisies of Nazareth' and 'primroses by the River's brink' there also, and we shall see in them the beauty which Dr. Macmillan saw here and draw from them the joy and wisdom. Did ever any man join nature to grace as he did? That kept him, and it will keep us as we read these sermons, from much of the evil that is in the world.

WHY DID CHRIST COME INTO THE WORLD?—*Stockwell*; 1s.

Mr. F. E. Marsh has much of the intensity of the early disciples, as if the time were short. He has no heart for flowers of rhetoric. 'Repent and

be baptized every one of you.' Now these are revival sermons, and altogether without other offence than the offence of the Cross.

THE OUTPOURED SPIRIT.—*Morgan & Scott*; 1s.

The editor of the *Christian*, Mr. R. C. Morgan, has published two sets of addresses here. The one set he contributed to his paper recently, the other forty years ago when it was called *The Revival*.

FROM SUNDAY TO SUNDAY.—*Isbister*.

Those fifty-two 'Bible Readings' were published first in *Good Words*. Was it that (for *Good Words* does not want much thinking or theology in its 'Bible Readings'), or what is it that makes us find so little in them? Excellent in tone, they do not seem to grip; they end before they seem to have begun. Dr. Moule can do best when he has time and space. Few can do better then.

THE GOSPEL OF JESUS CHRIST.—*Stockwell*; 2s. 6d. net.

Where were these sermons lying that Dr. Parker's own publishers did not find them? They are unmistakably his. No one is likely to imitate Dr. Parker. They are his in their flash of light, their thrust of sword, their sweep of love.

LIFE ON THE HEIGHTS.—*Stockwell*; 2s. net.

A wise man once said that when congregations have their choice they should always choose a preacher whose face is fair to look upon. A wiser man added that it were better if his soul were fair, for then he would lead the congregation away from himself to the face of Christ. We know nothing of Mr. Joseph Pearce's countenance, but he dwells on the beauty and the glory, and it must be well with his people.

CHRIST'S RELATION TO HIS PEOPLE.—*Passmore & Alabaster*; 7s.

The Rev. Andrew Murray read some of Mr. Spurgeon's sermons and wrote to his publishers. Could they not publish a volume, selecting those that dealt with Christ's relation to believers as their sanctification, their keeper, and their strength? The publishers responded. Mr. Murray wrote a preface. And here is as rich a series of discourses on the theme 'My Beloved is mine and I am His' as you will find.

CHRIST IN THE PRESENT AGE.—*Hodder & Stoughton*; 3s. 6d.

'I have been asked,' says Dr. Wells of Glasgow, 'how I would present and defend the Evangelical Verities after forty years of missionary and pastoral experience.' This book is my reply to that question. I have written for the average Christian who wishes to be ready to give a reason for the hope that is in him, and also for the inquirer who is in perplexity concerning the Christian creed and life.' That is the preface. It is the book's review. The book is all that the preface claims. If we might emphasize one note of it, we would say that it is above all a home missionary book. Dr. Wells has much interest in science and theology, but when they cease to reach the drunkard he has done with them.

FOLLOWING ON TO KNOW THE LORD.—*S. C. Brown*; 3s. 6d.

Archdeacon Wilberforce is not afraid of Balaam's Ass. He is not afraid to turn the story into a parable. It is equally irreverent in his eyes to jest about it and to say that God who made the throat of the ass could make that throat to speak. God is a God of order. And this parable is a parable

of the order that God demands in His universe. The one disorder in it is sin. And God will have none of that in Balaam or in you. That sermon is next to last. The last is even more courageous. Its title is 'The Lower Animals,' and Dr. Wilberforce has some things to say which events of more recent date than even his sermon make very pertinent indeed.

CONVENTION SERIES.—6d. each.

Two packets of Convention Addresses are published at the Drummond Tract Depot in Stirling.

TO BRITONS ABROAD.—*Blackwood*; 3s. 6d. net.

This volume is anonymous. The preacher was persuaded by an admiring hearer to publish, but he was not flattered to give his name. We are not even told where the sermons were preached. 'Abroad' leaves much guessing open. Well, the preacher is better hid. But the man who preached these sermons cannot be hid for ever. He knows how to take the things of earth and make them parables of the things of the Kingdom. He knows how to touch the human in his hearers, and how to make them responsive to the grace of God.

Recent Biblical and Oriental Archaeology.

By A. H. SAYCE, D.D., PROFESSOR OF ASSYRIOLOGY, OXFORD.

The Laws of Khammurabi.

ONE of the best publications called forth by the discovery of the code of ancient Babylonian law is *Moses und Hammurabi*, by Dr. Johannes Jeremias (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1903), and its extensive sale is a proof that it has been appreciated. A new and enlarged edition of it has just appeared, with many additions and improvements. In this new edition Dr. Jeremias dwells upon the contrasts as well as upon the resemblances that exist between the codes of Babylonia and Israel, and admits that there could have been no direct influence of the one upon the other. On the other hand, the list of parallel enactments, which he has drawn up between the code of Khammurabi and the Book of the Covenant is now presented in a form which makes it very striking.

When all is said, however, there remains the great fact that, in spite of numerous resemblances in detail, the two codes stand in strong contrast one to the other. The code of Khammurabi presupposes a highly civilized monarchy, with a wealthy commercial and agricultural population; the code of Moses is addressed to a compact and half-nomad community, whose wants are few and whose life is simple. From this point of view it is instructive to compare the two codes where they more or less cover the same ground. In that of Babylonia the primitive doctrine of blood-revenge is thrown into the background; in the code of Israel it runs through the whole legislation. Even cities of refuge are provided by the lawgiver, in which the manslayer may receive sanctuary and protection from private revenge. Babylonian law, on the other hand, allowed the individual to take

the law into his own hands in only two instances ; in all other cases the individual is superseded by the state, which alone has the right to punish. Private revenge is as stringently forbidden as it is in the England of to-day. Theft, on the contrary, is treated in the Babylonian code with Draconian severity, in striking contrast to the way in which it is regarded in the Mosaic law. In a great commercial community respect for property was naturally highly developed ; and to rob a man's house was as serious a crime as to kill the man himself. In a camp of confederated tribes the individual's private property was of comparatively little account. The laws of inheritance, again, in the two codes, present marked features of difference. The will, which played so large a part in Babylonian law, was unknown in Israel ; and the Babylonian system of adoption was similarly foreign to it. Even in minor details the contrast between the stages of culture presupposed by the two codes is equally apparent. The code of Khammurabi lays down laws for the surgeon and the veterinary : of either surgeon or veterinary the Pentateuch knows nothing. The community for which the Mosaic law-book was compiled was not only still in a tribal and semi-nomad condition, it was centuries behind the Babylonia of Khammurabi in culture and civilization.

The fact is all the more remarkable when we remember that Canaan had been for centuries a province of the Babylonian empire, in which the language, script, and laws of Babylonia were as well known as they were in Babylonia itself. It must be taken with the further fact that the patriarchal history contained in the Book of Genesis shows an acquaintance with laws of Khammurabi which we do not find in the code of Moses. The two facts are an important testimony to the substantially historical character of the narratives in Genesis, as well as to the traditional date of the Mosaic legislation. It is true that the Mosaic legislation includes enactments which imply a settled as well as a semi-nomad community, but, as Dr. Jeremias observes, the Israelites had lived in Goshen before they began the wandering life of the wilderness.

There is yet another point in which the codes of Babylonia and Israel are in broad contrast one to another. The moral and divine element which is so conspicuous in the second is absent from the first. The code of Israel rests upon the Ten

Commandments ; that of Babylonia on judicial precedents and the authority of the king. Khammurabi does, indeed, commence the preamble of his code with an invocation to the 'supreme god,' and the bas-relief at the head of the monument on which it is engraved represents him as receiving it from the sun-god ; but in the body of the law itself we look in vain for any recognition of a divine sanction or a moral origin. Crime, and not sin, is the object which the legislation has in view.

At the same time it must be remembered that the ritual law of Babylonia has not yet been discovered. There are references to it in the first two enactments of the code, and the so-called 'Babylonian confession' shows that something analogous to the Ten Commandments must once have existed. Until it is discovered, Babylonia necessarily offers no parallel to a large part of the Mosaic legislation. But, even where the two legislations occupy the same ground, the spirit which runs through them—the foundation, as it were, on which they are built—is wholly different. Crime was punished in Babylonia because it was injurious to society, not because it was an offence against God. Dr. Jeremias traces to this fact the superior humanity of the Mosaic law. The slave is not a mere chattel in its eyes, as he was in Babylonia, where his master had the power of life and death ; and protection was given to the slave of another, on commercial and not on humane grounds. In Israel, on the other hand, it was forbidden to kill or maltreat the slave (Ex 21^{20, 26, 27}), and even the foreign fugitive slave was allowed his freedom. We must not forget, however, that even in Ex 21²¹ the slave is declared to be a chattel, and his more humane treatment by Israelitish law goes along with the general fact that the society for which the Mosaic legislation was made had none of the respect for private property which prevailed in Babylonia, and was not sharply divided into rich and poor.

In the last section of his little book Dr. Jeremias has a few pertinent remarks on the two great legislators of Semitic antiquity whose codes have come down to us—Moses and Khammurabi. The code of Moses no longer stands alone : for the first time we can compare it with another and older code, and submit it, accordingly, to a scientific examination. As the Tel el-Amarna tablets disproved the supposed illiteracy of the Mosaic age, so the discovery of the code of Khammurabi has

now disproved the assumption that no codification of law was possible at such a date. On the contrary, Western Asia was familiar with the conception centuries before Moses was born.

And in the light of this latest discovery of Oriental archæology it is difficult to see when the Israelitish code could have been compiled, except in the age to which tradition refers it. Babylonian law was the law of Canaan down to the time of its conquest by the Israelites; and after the conquest, when Israelite and Canaanite had intermingled, and the culture of the conquered was more and more influencing their ruder conquerors, its principles must have been, to a certain extent, embodied in any code of laws which could have been then put together. In the age of the monarchy, indeed, its background would have been, not the desert, but a settled kingdom like that of Khammurabi. Even the form of the individual laws

composing it bears witness to the truth of the story of its origin. The form is identical with that in which the laws of Khammurabi are cast, beginning with the hypothetical 'If,' and, since the form assumed by the Babylonian laws is due to the fact that they are decisions of the royal judges in specific cases, we are justified in concluding that the Mosaic laws also were, in the first instance, judicial decisions. Now this is exactly what they are stated to have been in Ex 18²⁴⁻²⁶.

It is clear that pentateuchal criticism will have to be thoroughly revised. We have at last a scientific basis from which to start in our examination of the Mosaic legislation. Theories must make way for facts, subjective impressions for the scientific method of comparison. Some, at any rate, of the results to which this is likely to lead can be gathered from the pages of Dr. Jeremias' little book.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Original Documents on the Reformation.¹

THIS is the first part of a new collection of original documents bearing on the history of Protestantism. The editors promise such important writings as the Heidelberg Catechism and Luther's Prefaces to the New Testament. In the present booklet we have three sets of *Theses* and a few fragments, possibly, from another set. The first set deals with the question—*De viribus et voluntate hominis sine gratia*; and the fragments which follow concern the same subject. The second set of theses makes a *Disputatio contra scholasticam theologiam*. The third consists of a *Disputatio Heidelbergæ habita*. The first two are the 'promotion,' or as we would say the 'graduation,' theses of students of Luther; and the third contains the heads of a disputation held under his presidency. Dr. Stange holds that we can extract from them what Luther taught his students in his earlier

lectures. His principal reasons for so thinking are that they come from Luther's students, Bartholomæus Bernhardus and Franz Günther; that they are not of the common type of students' graduation theses, and are almost free from the common dialectical extravagances which characterized the theses of the times; and that they contain what has all the appearance of being the fundamental principles of a new system of theology. Hence their value, in the eyes of the editor, for the student of the origins of the doctrines of the Reformation.

It may be doubted whether Dr. Stange is not disposed to place too high a value upon these fragments of Reformation university life and work. The editor is impressed with a theory of his own about the fundamental character of the Reformation theology. He holds that it differed from all other, because its distinctive characteristic was that it always treated the problems of Christian faith in a peculiar way. It looked at them exclusively from a point of view determined by certain clearly defined ethical conceptions. Dr. Stange finds a proof for this idea of his in the contents of these relics of the times of the Reformation. It is scarcely the best preparation for the task of selecting typical

¹ *Die Ältesten Ethischen Disputationen Luthers*. Herausgegeben von Dr. C. Stange, o.ö. Professor in Königsberg. Leipzig: A. Deichert, 1904. Price 1s. 8d. (*Quellenschriften zur Geschichte des Protestantismus*. Herausgegeben von Joh. Kunze und C. Stange. 1 Heft. Leipzig: A. Deichert).

original writings to illustrate a period of history, to come with a ready-made theory. Why does not some editor give us a careful edition of all the remains of Luther's earliest lectures which have descended to us, beginning with the notes he wrote on his great Latin Bible still preserved for us in the Wolfenbüttel Library, and ending with his tract of September 1517 against the influence of Aristotle? We take leave to say that such a selection, enriched with notes, telling us what his contemporary letters relate about the growth of his ideas, would be very much more valuable than any number of students' theses, especially if the editor came to his task unfettered by a preconceived theory of what he ought to find.

T. M. LINDSAY.

Glasgow.

The Talmud and Theology.

IN the second number of the *Hibbert Journal* Mr. C. G. Montefiore appealed to Christian theologians to give heed to 'what the great Rabbinic scholars have to tell.' His cogent reasoning will suffice to convince any who still need convincing that a knowledge of contemporary Jewish religion is of the greatest value to the student of the New Testament. Christian interpreters are probably more willing than this able writer supposes to welcome all the light which Jewish literature can cast upon the beliefs and practices of the Jews before, during, and immediately after the times of Christ; they also share the regret, frankly expressed by Mr. Montefiore, that Jewish scholars have done so little to make their historic theology known. The Hebraist, be he Jew or Christian, who will make the facts accessible to intelligent students, will serve the cause of truth.

In March 1903 a lecture,¹ which has since been published, was delivered in the 'Delitzsch' Jewish Institute by Lic. theol. Paul Fiebig. From this pamphlet much may be learnt in regard both to the material already available and the directions in which further research is most needed.

Fiebig's argument in the early part of his lecture tends to show—what the researches of Dalman and

Deissmann respectively illustrate—that it is as important to study the N.T. in its Hebrew form as to study the O.T. in its Greek form. With Delitzsch's Hebrew N.T. as well as with the Septuagint the Christian theologian should be familiar. What is chiefly needed is a trustworthy edition of the Targums, that is, of the O.T. as it was translated, verse by verse for the most part, into Aramaic by the *m. turg. mân*, or synagogue-interpreter. It is probable that the written Targums date from the time of Christ, and they are extant in Rabbinic Bibles; but the only editions mentioned are Lagarde's *Prophete chaldaice*, and those of Franz Prætorius on the Books of Joshua and Judges.² A knowledge of the Targums, which were translations for practical purposes, would help us to perceive how the O.T. was understood in N.T. times.

A succinct and interesting account is given of the attempts already made to utilize the Great Midrash, or Rabbinic commentary on the Pentateuch and some of the Hagiographa. The date of the earliest of these expositions is the beginning of the second century A.D. They are therefore of importance, not only on account of their interpretations of the O.T., but also, as Kautzsch³ has pointed out, on account of the examples which they supply of Jewish exegesis at the opening of the Christian era. Honourable mention is made of Schlatter's work,⁴ in which the Mechilta, or Midrash on Exodus, is employed to cast light on the problem of the origin of the Fourth Gospel.

To the Talmud proper Strack has published a valuable introduction.⁵ Fiebig gives a popular account of the two parts of the Talmud, namely: (1) the Mishna, which is more than a mere repetition of the Law, and (2) the Gemara, or completion of the Law—a collection of Rabbinic comments on the Mishna. In the Mishna is found an account of life under the Law in the time of Christ; there is much theorizing, but there are also many glimpses of actuality. The issue of the first part of Dr. L. Rosenthal's work⁶ is gratefully chronicled; mention is made of Jost's translation of the Mishna into

² *Das Targum zum Buch der Richter* in jemenischer Ueberlieferung, ebenso dass. *zum Buche Josua*. 1899 und 1900. Berlin: Reuther u. Reichard.

³ *Religionsunterricht und Bibelwissenschaft*. Halle, 1900.

⁴ *Die Sprache und Heimat des vierten Evangelisten*. 1902.

⁵ *Einleitung in den Talmud*. 2 Aufl. Hinrichs, 1894.

⁶ *Die Mischna, Aufbau und Quellscheidung*. 1 Teil. Strassburg, 1903.

¹ *Talmud und Theologie*. Ein Vortrag von Lic. theol. Paul Fiebig, am Institutum Judaicum Delitzschianum in Leipzig. Sammlung gemeinverständlicher Vorträge und Schriften, 36. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr.; London: Williams & Norgate.

Hebrew letters, and of a German translation which is in course of publication in Berlin. Strack has made a 'modest beginning' of a critical revision of the text,¹ and Laible has translated into German the Josefta,² which is a collection of traditions not included in the Mishna. The Babylonian Talmud is the 'canonical holy book of the Jews,' but before the material stored in its twelve folio volumes can be made easy of access a competent scholar must 'work on it ten years.' Each volume should have a full index, and should be more accurately translated. Goldschmidt's translation,³ which is now being issued, is described as useful, but sometimes as difficult to understand as the original; Schwab's French translation of the much smaller Jerusalem Talmud is 'no less faulty.' As specimens of work that needs to be undertaken without delay, Fiebig mentions the determination of the chronological order of the Rabbis, and the correction of errors which may exist notwithstanding the extraordinary memory of those whose calling it was to repeat the traditions orally. Some of these 'living Encyclopedias' did not understand what they recited; therefore the great Rabbis would sometimes interrupt them, correct the tradition, and bid them no longer repeat such nonsense.

In the second part of his lecture Fiebig gives examples of valuable contributions already made to theology by students of Jewish literature. From the Mishna and the Josefta Dr. Franz Delitzsch gathered the details which impart the charm of verisimilitude to his pictures of Jewish manners and customs in his books, *A Day in Capernaum* and *Iris*. Further study of the same sources may be expected to elucidate such problems as the relation of the Last Supper to the Passover,⁴ and the date of the Crucifixion.⁵ On the latter subject N.T. students are advised to consult Lichtenstein's *Hebrew Commentary on the N.T.*, published by Professor Dalman. What is needed is a compilation of the sayings of the various Rabbis after the pattern of Bacher's important work,⁶ or Schlatter's monograph.⁷ Other desiderata are studies of Jewish literature which would embody the results of a scientific investigation of the Rabbinic miracles

and parables, and of the ethical teaching of the Talmud. In support of his plea for the undertaking of such work without delay, Fiebig is able to quote theologians of different schools of thought, for in regard to its desirability the so-called 'positives' and the 'liberals' are of one mind. The most important contribution recently made by Bousset to this subject must not be forgotten, but even he confesses: 'The later Jewish literature is an inexhaustible mine of older material which has never been systematically explored. . . . With inconceivable tenacity ancient traditions were adhered to, the result being that in mediæval writings the most ancient material is embedded.'⁸

The reply to those who complain that Christian theologians have only a slight acquaintance with Rabbinic teaching, and ascribe this lack of knowledge to anti-Semitic prejudice, is that the difficulties of the task are almost insurmountable without the co-operation of Jewish scholars. Even when the initial difficulties have been overcome, as, e.g., the acquisition of a thorough knowledge of Semitic languages, and the gaining of the power to disentangle the thought from the complicated—sometimes enigmatic and sometimes elliptical—sentences of the Talmud, the student is still confronted by what Perles, a Jewish critic of Bousset's book, describes as 'the mass of material to be dealt with,' enough to 'crush every one who has not been familiar with this realm of thought from early youth.' Fiebig addresses, therefore, a powerful appeal to both Jews and Christians. The Jews are asked to make their literature more accessible. The difficulty of reading modern Hebrew works need not be increased by the frequent use of abbreviations, which are indecipherable without a knowledge of New Hebrew and dialectic jargon. Translations into modern languages should also be published. Christians are urged to co-operate. Readers in Rabbinic literature should be appointed at the universities. The Jewish Institute at Leipzig, founded by the late Dr. Delitzsch, only needs to be more generously supported to add to its work of training missionaries to the Jews the equally important work of spreading accurate knowledge of Judaism amongst Christians, and accurate knowledge of Christianity amongst the Jews. The director of the Institute, Professor Dalman, and the two tutors, Lichtenstein and Kahan, possess, in Fiebig's judgment, a combination of

¹ *Schriften des Institutum Judaicum in Berlin.*

² *Der Josephtraktat Berachot übersetzt.* Frankfurt.

³ Berlin: Calvary.

⁴ Cf. Chwolson, *Das letzte Passahmahl Christi.*

⁵ Cf. Laible, *Jesus in den Talmud.*

⁶ *Ag-ada der Tannaiten und der Amoräer.*

⁷ *Jochanan ben Zakkai.* 1899.

⁸ *Religion des Judentums im neuest. Zeitalter.* 1903.

learning and gifts which qualify them to render service for which every scientific theologian would be grateful.

J. G. TASKER.

Handsworth College.

Haussleiter and Wrede on the Fourth Gospel.¹

PROFESSOR HAUSSLEITER attempts a bold solution of the difficult problem presented by the appendix to the Fourth Gospel. He contends that in this closing chapter Andrew and Philip added their testimony to that already given by their fellow-disciple John. The recurrence of 'we' in the body of the Gospel indicates that John wrote in the name of several, who like himself had been eye-witnesses of the life of Jesus. These other witnesses speak in their own person in the appendix. The clue to their identity is hidden in the second verse, where the list of the disciples who went fishing closes with the mention of 'two other disciples.' Haussleiter holds that the writers of the chapter are here following the precedent set them by John, who likewise alludes to himself darkly as 'that other disciple.' Analysis of the list makes it fairly certain that the two unnamed disciples are Andrew and Philip. These, then, are the witnesses who add their signature to the Gospel, but Haussleiter attempts to make his conclusion even more definite. He argues that, while both disciples concur in the final testimony, Andrew is the actual writer. The man who wrote 'I suppose the whole world would not contain the books that should be written' was clearly Andrew, who asked regarding the loaves and fishes, 'What are these among so many?' This one recorded saying of Andrew's is made the basis of a whole theory as to his character, his manner of thinking, and his literary style. The example quoted is fairly typical of Haussleiter's argument as a whole. His pamphlet is interesting and ingenious, but cannot be regarded as a serious contribution to Johannine criticism. The author claims that his

discovery of the apostolic witnesses removes all doubts of the historicity of the Gospel. Unfortunately, these doubts have first to be reckoned with, before his argument can be considered at all.

Wrede's pamphlet is written in a more scientific spirit. Assuming the critical conclusion in regard to date and authorship, the writer discusses in the first part of his work the main characteristics of the Gospel. He finds everywhere the traces of a theological intention beneath the historical narrative. In the second part he seeks to determine more exactly the nature of this intention. Agreeing with Baldensperger that the Gospel is essentially a polemic, he maintains that it is directed not so much against the Baptist party as against the Jews. The evangelist's chief concern is to meet the arguments of the Jews, who in the beginning of the second century were still the most dangerous enemies to the faith. His work is the first of the Apologies, and anticipates, in its main purpose, Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho*. Wrede would make this view of the Gospel normative for all study of the Johannine doctrine. 'The polemical tendency has determined the theological positions. The Gospel, so regarded, ceases to be a work of meditation, permanent in its significance, and must be viewed strictly in relation to its particular period and its particular aims.' Wrede is not the first who has emphasized the polemical element in the Fourth Gospel, but no previous critic has pushed this line of inquiry to such extreme conclusions. Perhaps he has done good service by carrying his argument to a point at which it becomes untenable. Criticism of late years has tended to make too much of the merely controversial aspects of John's Gospel. These aspects have doubtless to be considered, but in any just estimate of the 'spiritual Gospel' they hold a very secondary place. Such a work as Wrede's, in which the great religious ideas of John are all made subservient to a narrow polemic, furnishes the best answer to this new tendency of criticism. The author succeeds in proving that a certain strain of polemic is present in the Gospel; he convinces us by the inadequacy of his conclusions that much more is present. This reaction towards a saner view to which he compels us is perhaps the most valuable result of his work.

E. F. SCOTT.

¹ *Zwei Apostolischen Zeugen für das Johannesevangelium.* Von Dr. Johannes Haussleiter, ord. Prof. der Theologie in Greifswald. München: C. H. Beck. M. 1.20.—*Charakter und Tendenz des Johannesevangelium.* Von W. Wrede, Prof. an der Universität Breslau. Tübingen: Mohr; London: Williams & Norgate. Price 1s. 3d. net.

A New History of Israel.

By HOPE W. HOGG, M.A., PROFESSOR OF SEMITIC LANGUAGES, UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER.

MANY must have felt the difficulty of giving counsel when asked to recommend a suitable book on the history of Israel. The books are many, and the respective merits of some of them are generally recognized; but in the middle of 1903 what was the book to recommend? The answer was not easy.

It would not be strange if the difficulty remained as great as ever. The new work of Professor H. P. Smith¹ is not a history of Israel; it is an Old Testament history. Moreover, it is not an independent work. It is the second Old Testament volume in a theological library. Its being second, and following the first after an interval of twelve years, may seem strange, especially as meanwhile no less than eight other volumes of the series have appeared. The reasons for the delay, however, are obvious. Professor Francis Brown and Bishop Ryle have had their hands full of other work; Professor Smith has meanwhile given us his *Samuel*; and the other contributor is the late A. B. Davidson. In any case, we at the end of 1903 cannot regret the postponement of vol. 2 till now, since if it had appeared eleven years ago it would for that very reason now be inadequate. One has only to think of the investigations connected with such names as Kusters, Meyer, van Hoonacker, Winckler, Budde, Cheyne, Willrich, Marquart, Gunkel, Steuernagel; of the two biblical encyclopædias, two practically complete series of commentaries, one incomplete English series, and the Polychrome Bible; of two biblical archæologies and two handbooks on Palestine, besides other works and endless learned articles, to see how inadequate a history written simultaneously with Driver's *Introduction* would necessarily be now.

One wonders, however, whether if the series had been planned now the title of the book would have been what it is. The title of Guthe's work in the German theological series is *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*; and why might not Smith's have been a History of Israel? Smith explains in the preface

that something different is wanted. The subject is to 'be treated in its relation to our religion.' To understand the limitations within which the author worked, it must be premised further that in the same series there are to be volumes on 'Contemporary History of the Old Testament,' 'Theology of the Old Testament,' 'Biblical Archæology,' 'Contemporary History of the New Testament,' 'The Study of the Old Testament,' and 'Biblical Encyclopædia,' which last will give the history of the various studies, including 'history.' It is necessary to remind oneself of this programme to avoid the danger of criticising the History for the absence of what was excluded, not by the writer, but by the general editors of the series.

Smith truly says, 'Every new advance in criticism involves a rewriting of history' (p. vii); 'The analysis of the critic must constantly be checked by the historian's synthesis' (p. xi). 'The ideal historian . . . is the one who is able to distinguish degrees of probability' 'without the monotonous and irritating repetition of "perhaps," "probably"' (p. xiii). 'The purpose of the present volume is to put into narrative form the results of recent Old Testament study' (p. vii). How far has he succeeded?

The book strikes the reader as being remarkably free from prejudice. Its statements of opinion appear to rest, in so far as the reader can judge, on a judicial examination of carefully collected evidence. The narrative runs smoothly. The outline is not blurred by a maze of details or prolonged discussions. The proportion of parts to whole is well maintained, and the reader is carried along from one development to another till he finds himself in the days of Herod, when the thread is somewhat abruptly cut. The editors' remark in the preface to the series, which is not reprinted in this volume, that 'the text will be made as readable and attractive as possible,' is justified.

The outline of the history is, on the whole, intelligible, and the development of ideas as the various creations of Hebrew literature are described in their proper places gives one the feeling that we now really know a good deal about Israel. Some

¹ *Old Testament History*. By Henry Preserved Smith, D.D., Professor of Biblical History and Interpretation in Amherst College. Pp. xxv, 512. ('The International Theological Library'; T. & T. Clark, 1903.)

of the clearness of presentation is due to the author's judicious way of using modern terms, such as sheikh, wezir, emir, backsheesh, jinn, durbar, harem, in preference to the accustomed terms, which are often worn counters. For example, when he calls the royal sanctuary built by Solomon a cathedral, the metaphor helps the student to remember that the other sanctuaries were not only in the country, but also here and there in different parts of Jerusalem itself. The many references, especially in the footnotes, to parallels in other histories serve a similar purpose. The Philistines, for example, are compared to the Northmen in our own history; and the history of Islam is frequently drawn on for illustrations. As a possible textbook for those who have to teach the history of Israel, Smith's book will be a great help.

The considerations which must determine the use of the Hebrew sources are discussed carefully, and the principles laid down are sound: we must first recover the history of tradition, and then inquire for the facts which lie behind the tradition. Smith's history, however, differs from that of Kent, for example, in not formally discussing the sources in detail. That is left, presumably, to Driver, Brown, and Ryle. The discussion of Gn 1-11 is fresh and interesting. Its position at the beginning of the work is a result of the title. In a 'History of Israel' it would have been more naturally taken, as by Guthe, later—*e.g.* in connexion with J or P.

The discussion of the 'Patriarchs' is perhaps the best general treatment in English. The conclusion is that Israel and others settled in Palestine as nomads from the East, and became more or less amalgamated with the Canaanites. The criticism of the Exodus narratives is more detailed. Smith concludes that 'there may have been'—he evidently thinks there was—an Israelite clan that sojourned in Egypt. It was 'not improbably' led forth by a religious leader. At Kadesh it formed with other clans an alliance sanctioned by Yahweh, the storm-god of Sinai (p. 72). The connexion between this, however, and the 'two streams of migration' that 'have issued from Arabia from time immemorial' (p. 73) is not very clear. One stream threatens Palestine directly; the other flows northwards, but, baffled there, reaches Palestine by way of Damascus and Bashan. Professor Smith has, obviously, carefully weighed the discussions on the various questions connected with the beginnings

of Israel; but his method precludes, in many cases, anything more than a hint of his reasons for his judgments. On the question of Musri, for example, he simply says (p. 66) that the sources do not recognize such a North Arabian kingdom. One is therefore somewhat surprised (and pleased) to find later (p. 247, note 3) that 'some of the biblical passages that now speak of Egypt may have originally referred to such a district in Arabia.' We have not noticed anywhere, however, any indication of such passages; we are simply referred to the article 'Mizraim' in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*. In the present position of the questions involved, the 'exodus' and the 'settlement' are perhaps more satisfactorily discussed together. It seems a pity to decide to 'retain the conventional term' 'conquest' (p. 75) when 'settlement' is so much more suitable. We are not surprised to find that Professor Smith thinks (p. 83) that Judah entered from the south. The use made of the Amarna letters in criticising the stories of the settlement is excellent—only, the reader would be apt to suppose that the people to whom Smith refers are always in the letters called *Habiri*. Not only Asher but also its brother Gad is plausibly regarded as 'adopted' into Israel; but surely the remark that 'in historic times the [transjordanic] district belonged to Reuben' is insufficiently considered. It would be hard to find contemporary evidence of that. On the whole, the account of the settlement and the earliest period is one of the strongest parts of the book.

In the account of Saul, David, and Solomon the plan of following the Hebrew literature seems to lead to rather undue detail, and here in particular Smith hardly seems to carry out fully enough his very sound distinction between the earliest tradition and the facts lying behind it. The account of the period of the monarchy we cannot, of course, criticise in detail. Of the schism Smith rightly says: 'At the time of the revolt there was no consciousness of anti-religious motive on the part of the northern tribes, and probably no accusation of apostasy was made by Judah.' We may quote the interesting judgment that 'Jeroboam deserves a place among those patriots who have roused a suffering people to throw off the yoke of oppression' (p. 180). The account of the relations with the Aramæans seems, on the other hand, rather too favourable to Israel: 'It can hardly be called unreasonable, therefore, to suppose that Ahab was

the moving spirit in the alliance' (p. 195). The footnote on the chronology strikes a sound note (p. 202); but perhaps more might have been said on the question without trenching too much on Driver's *Introduction* volume. The development of religious ideas, as evidenced in the literature, is skilfully dealt with. The story about the priest sent to teach the new settlers in Ephraim is wisely rejected. One must question, however, the statement on the next page (232), that 'with the incorporation of Ephraim into the Assyrian province called "Beyond the River," it ceases to belong to the history of Israel.' Smith himself admits that the always mixed population simply became more strongly mixed, and that the new settlers adopted the worship of Yahweh. Surely one of the most pressing needs is precisely more light on the true history of Northern Israel after its incorporation in the Assyrian empire.

The account of the adoption of the Book of Instruction under Josiah, and its far-reaching effect, does not dispose of all aspects of the question,—it assumes the other handbooks in the series,—but it is clear and fresh. The change, e.g., in the 'passover' festival, 'is as if the American Thanksgiving from being a family reunion festival should be changed to a great pilgrimage to some national sanctuary' (p. 267). 'Politically, the action taken by Josiah was a new departure—practically nothing less than the adoption of a written constitution for the people' (p. 272). The adoption of Deuteronomy is shown to have been the first step towards 'the adoption of legalism, and the supremacy of the Scribes' (p. 274).

It need not be said that the period immediately following the incorporation of Judah in the Babylonian empire receives careful study. It was to be expected that Smith would take the view that the rebuilding of the temple of Jerusalem was the work of the Jews of Judæa. This view is now familiar to English readers. The belief that Judah was not, any more than Israel, depopulated does not of course imply that Israel did not feel that it had fallen under sore chastisement. How men of thought tried to solve the problem of Israel's sufferings is well told in the account given of the Books of Job and Deutero-Isaiah. Merely noting, with some surprise, that Smith is content to regard the whole of the second part of Isaiah as the work of one man, written at different times, but all after the age of Cyrus, we must hurry on to the chapter entitled 'Nehemiah and After.'

No part of Smith's work will be read with more interest. He follows the view of Marquart, Torrey, and others, that Nehemiah's master was Artaxerxes II. Mnemon. Cheyne, in 1902, like Kent, in 1899, in his history, decided in favour of

Artaxerxes I. More important is the position taken up by Smith with regard to Ezra. Kent, writing in 1899, said: 'It is significant that, with the one exception of the tradition preserved by the Chronicler, in the writings of the next two or three centuries the name of Nehemiah is immortalized, while that of Ezra is ignored.' Professor Smith says: 'What, then, is the historical fact which the story of Ezra represents? It is this: During the century after Nehemiah the community in Judah was becoming more rigid in its exclusiveness and in its devotion to the ritual. Ezra is the impersonation of both tendencies.' According to this view, then, Ezra must submit to the same fate as Moses, so far as the Torah is concerned. It is very interesting that the second volume in this series should thus take rank with the first of twelve years ago in formally introducing a startling theory to the English general reader. The question is of course important; but its importance must not be exaggerated. 'The great historical fact remains, that in this period the codification of ancient customs and regulations reached its conclusion,' 'or at least reached a provisional conclusion' (p. 400). The question is one the interest of which is mainly historical.

There is no diminution of interest in the account of the Greek period—an age of migration and cities—and the Maccabæan, with their important contributions to Hebrew literature. After that the sketch becomes more rapid; but then the history of New Testament times will take up the story.

To sum up now the impression produced by the book as a whole: Many things one misses: a systematic account of sources, especially non-biblical; an account and discussion of rejected theories; authorities, biblical and other, for the statements made; a definite picture of the life of the people and its conditions; a fuller recognition of the fact that Israel was part of a great world in the life of which it shared. While we miss these things, we perceive that they are to be supplied by the other volumes of the series. On the other hand, we have a clear, interesting, instructive account of the growth of Israel, embodying a series of careful judgments on the countless problems that face the man who tries to understand the life of that remarkable people. The 'History' takes its place worthily by the side of Driver's *Introduction*. The student of to-day is to be congratulated on having so valuable an addition made to his stock of tools.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, St. Cyrus, Montrose.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE Rev. C. H. W. Johns, M.A., Fellow of Queens' College, Cambridge, has written an article for the Extra Volume of the *Dictionary of the Bible* on THE CODE OF HAMMURABI.

Winckler described Hammurabi's Code as the greatest discovery yet made in the East. And the interest in it is not only maintained but seems to be steadily rising. The most popular book on the subject is Mr. Stanley Cook's, which is reviewed by Mr. Johns in this issue. The great English edition is coming from America, under the editorship of Professor R. F. Harper of Chicago. But scholars are working on it everywhere. And Mr. Johns will take account in his article in the Extra Volume of all that has been done, offering a corrected translation, estimating the religious worth of the Code, and discussing its influence on Mosaism.

A keen struggle is going on at present between Christianity and Agnosticism. Its centre seems to be in Manchester. And to the Central Hall in Manchester dense crowds of men are going every Sunday night to hear what Christianity has to say for itself. They are mostly working men. For this is a working man's battle.

The lecturers are carefully chosen. We observe
VOL. XV.—5

the Headmaster of the Manchester Grammar School, Dr. James Moulton of Didsbury College, Professor Peake of the Primitive Methodist College, Archdeacon Wilson, Canon Hicks, Principal Adeney of the Lancashire Independent College, the Rev. Henry Haigh, an able missionary from the Mysore, and Mr. Frank Ballard. When the lecture is over a conference begins. The working man, who has used his ears, now finds his voice. And when the meeting has dispersed the lecture is printed and sent out in its thousands for a penny. That is the modern method of the ancient and aristocratic game of Apologetics.

We have read one of the lectures. The lecturer is Dr. Moulton. His special topic, under the general subject of all the lectures—'Is Christianity True?'—is 'How God prepared for Christianity' (C. H. Kelly, and all the booksellers; rd.). Dr. Moulton gets into touch with his audience at once. He lays down the proposition: 'I want to show how God made man in such a way that Christianity was the one thing that was fitted for him.'

By putting himself in touch with his audience Dr. Moulton puts himself in the very front of the battle. It is not religion that is assailed in our day, it is the Christian religion. No one denies the necessity of a religion of some kind for every

man. The Agnostic, who is now an Agnostic in relation to Christ rather than to God, takes credit for having discovered the universality of religion. Man is so made that he must have a religion. The only question is, 'Which is the best religion for him?' The Agnostic answers that practically every man's own religion is the best religion for him. Christianity is one of the religions. It has to take its chance with the rest. It may be better than some, and worse than others. Dr. Moulton says, 'Man is so made that Christianity is the one thing fitted for him.' He and the Agnostic can give no quarter.

The ferocity of a battle is often due to the weapons with which it is fought. Dr. Moulton knows that the Agnostic is using the weapons of latest and best manufacture. He knows where they come from. He turns at once to Dr. Frazer's *Golden Bough*.

For it is Comparative Religion with its twin science of Anthropology that supplies the modern Agnostic with his weapons of war. That is why so many of us are helpless in the presence of modern unbelief. Anthropology has not yet reached our Colleges. No rich man has thought yet of endowing a Chair of Comparative Religion. But Dr. Moulton has made a study of Comparative Religion for himself. In the department of the Persian Religion he has scarcely an equal now in England.

He turns to Dr. Frazer's *Golden Bough*. Not that Dr. Frazer is on the side of the unbeliever. As a Cambridge man Dr. Moulton is proud of Dr. Frazer, and proud that he is privileged with Dr. Frazer's friendship. But the *Golden Bough* has been hastily read by certain Agnostics. They have discovered from the *Golden Bough* that there are features of Christianity, and these the most essential features, which are found in the other religions of the world also, even among the manners and customs of some of the lowest savages. And, having already a prejudice against

Christianity, they say that Christianity has nothing which other religions do not have; it is doubtful indeed if it has anything worth having which it has not borrowed.

Dr. Moulton denies the borrowing. He doubts if there has ever been much borrowing by one religion from another. It is a charge that is easily made, but it is usually made by amateurs in Comparative Religion. There are certain parallels between Judaism and the doctrines of the Parsis, between Christianity and Buddhism. Borrowing is the very first thought that occurs, and that religion was the borrower against which the prejudice is most strong. Dr. Moulton would not be afraid to say that all the while the Jews were under the sway of the Persians, they may have gained some religious ideas which they developed in accordance with their own genius and their own destiny. But the deeper study of one religion and another makes the charge of borrowing always less impressive. And Dr. Moulton looks straight at the working men who listen to him, and says, if you are told that Christianity is not original, 'if you are asked to believe that there are other sacred books in the world which can for one moment be compared with the Bible, and especially with the Gospels, I have to ask you to *read those sacred books*.'

And now the battle is growing hot. For now Dr. Moulton does not deny the parallels between the doctrines of Christianity and those of other religions. He does not deny that other religions as well as Christianity have their Incarnation, their Atonement, their Virgin-birth, their God-Man. He knows that when the first Roman Catholic missionaries went to Mexico, they found something exactly corresponding to the Christian Eucharist already practised there, and in their amazement said the devil was parodying the most sacred Christian rite. He knows that in degraded religions there are parallels to the doctrine of the New Birth, that doctrine which 'is preached in this and countless other centres of Christian

teaching with such wonderful effects upon the lives of men to-day.'

He does not deny the parallels. And he knows that he has to reckon with them. Dr. Moulton is not afraid to reckon with them in a way that is new to the Christian apologist. He is not afraid to find their meaning along the lines of Evolution.

'In the physical world, as science teaches us, God works mainly by evolution. I am not going to give an opinion as to the truth of the theory of evolution this afternoon.' But then, when he has told the man of science to keep his hands off theology, as he, a theologian, keeps his hands off science, he accepts evolution as the theory which largely explains the method of God's working in nature. 'We need make no reservation in the matter,' he says, 'and we may well believe that the theory helps us in a very wonderful way to understand the dealings of God with this world of ours.'

Very well, Dr. Moulton accepts evolution. He accepts it all round. He accepts it in the world of mind as well as in the world of matter. And he believes that when God came to bring to men's hearts the knowledge of Himself, it is most likely that He would *evolve* the idea of Deity just as He evolved everything else. Now there is one principle in evolution that must not be lost sight of. We know that sometimes one is chosen to suffer for others. It is also true that sometimes one is chosen to be a blessing to others. There is nothing new therefore, far less is there anything contradictory to God's method of evolution, in the choice of the one small kingdom of Israel to be a blessing to all the kingdoms of the world. The Athenian was chosen to receive the blessings of intellect, of art and science and literature, and to give them to the world. The Roman was chosen to teach men the blessings of law and government. It is in accordance with the strictest scientific doctrine of evolution that the least of all lands should be set

apart to receive and transmit the greatest of all blessings to the world, the blessing of the knowledge of God.

The principle of selection—election we call it theologically—does not contradict the principle that evolution is along the whole line. Dr. Moulton believes that in every nation there have been those that feared God and wrought righteousness. He believes that wherever we find the idea of incarnation, of atonement, of resurrection, and we find them almost everywhere, not only were these the gift of God to every tribe and nation by however natural a process of evolution, but he also believes that they were given to make the soil the more ready to receive the seed that should fall into it in the fulness of time and from the 'favoured' race of the Jews.

Then he presses home his proposition. That is why he holds that Christianity is the only thing that is fitted for man. That is why the gospel somehow continues to touch the human heart in every part of the world. That is why it has spoken not only to one race, like other religions, but to every race throughout the world. In Christ is found all that the other religions imply—Incarnation, Atonement, Resurrection, the New Birth, Eucharistic Communion—and they are found in Him free from the local and the temporary, perfect in the satisfaction they bring, yet opening the way to the freedom of evolution still in every believer as he goes on from grace to grace, as he is changed into the same image from glory to glory.

Is the act of Christ in giving Himself a ransom best described as substitutionary or as representative? Or does it matter how we describe it?

It does matter how we describe it. The notion that a theory of the Atonement is unnecessary is a frivolous if not an unthinkable notion. We cannot believe in Christ if we do not know who Christ is. And we know who Christ is by knowing what

He has done for us. It makes all the difference to us that we hold a theory of the Atonement. And so also it makes all the difference to us what theory of the Atonement we hold. If we hold that Christ was and is outside of us, apart from us, when He died for us, if we hold, that is to say, the substitutionary theory of the Atonement; or if we hold that He became one with us, entered into us, was and is identified with us, in dying for us and in rising again from the dead, it makes all the difference to us.

It does not make the difference, it is true, of heaven or of hell. But heaven or hell is not the only consideration. It is a comparatively unimportant consideration. For heaven and hell, as external and future, are little dealt with in Scripture, and should be little regarded by us. What is important is what we are in ourselves now. That makes heaven or hell for us. And the question whether Christ is our Substitute or our Representative tells vitally upon that.

For if Christ is our Substitute, simply, solely; if He died for us only to make it possible for us to return to God, by paying our debt; if He then went back to God to wait our coming: it is not certain that any of us will ever return. Why should we return?

Professor Denney says that gratitude should induce us to return. But gratitude is the last attainment of noble minds. There is no grace so rare in common humanity, or so inoperative. Common men remember the benefits they have conferred on others and wonder that other men can be so ungrateful. It is doubtful if gratitude has ever brought one human soul back to God. Minds must be noble before gratitude can move them, and they must be back to God before they are noble.

But if Christ is our Representative, and especially if we mean, as Professor Peake means, by saying Christ is our Representative, that He is identified with us, so that His act is our act,—His death our

death, and His resurrection our resurrection,—then we have returned to God, and we are already sitting with God in heavenly places.

A controversy is going on between Professor Denney and Professor Peake on this matter. Professor Denney stated his view of the Atonement of Christ in the book entitled *Studies in Theology*. Professor Peake criticised it in the *Primitive Methodist Quarterly*, and stated his own view in his *Guide to Biblical Study*. Professor Denney again stated his view, more fully and more energetically, in his book on the *Death of Christ*. Professor Peake again criticised it in the *Primitive Methodist Quarterly*. Professor Denney replied in a series of lectures delivered at the Summer School in Aberdeen, which afterwards were published as *The Atonement and the Modern Mind*. The reply was still more energetic in expression. Professor Peake makes his fullest and final criticism in the *Expositor* for January. He too can use energetic language.

He says, 'Not, of course, that I hope to convince Dr. Denney. He has that happy temperament which is not clouded by misgivings as to the soundness of his conclusions, and which airily brushes aside views that do not appeal to him, as meaningless or fantastic, or things not to be taken seriously.' Professor Denney calls the idea that Christ was a Representative and His act a racial act 'a fantastic abstraction.' 'I own,' he says, 'I can see nothing profound in it except a profound misapprehension of the apostle.' It is 'in principle,' he says, 'to deny the whole grace of the Gospel, and to rob it of every particle of its motive power.' Professor Peake calls the last 'a sweeping assertion, to which I hardly think Professor Denney would adhere in cold blood.' And he says, 'Keen-sighted as he is on many sides, he appears, if I also may practise an engaging frankness, to be colour-blind to one realm of Pauline ideas.'

But the controversy, this time, is not about

words. It goes as deep as either of them sees or can express. In Dr. Denney's view Justification by Faith is the central doctrine of Christianity, and settles all the rest. In Professor Peake's view Justification by Faith is of very doubtful morality. He doubts if the statement that God pronounces a man righteous, when as a matter of fact he is a sinner, is calculated to assure those whose faith in the morality of Paulinism has been undermined. And he wonders why we should give the enemy more cause to blaspheme than they have at present.

In Professor Peake's view the central doctrine of Christianity is Christ's mystical union with the race. From that there may follow the mystical union of the believer with Christ. And Professor Peake finds that union expressed in the words: 'It is no longer I that live, but Christ liveth in Me.' It is not the believer's union with Christ, however, that is either the first or the essential thing, it is Christ's union with the race.

'As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive'—that is Professor Peake's pivotal passage. But what is death in Adam? It is the death of the body. And what is life in Christ? It is the resurrection of the body. Professor Peake says that both sides of the equation must be universal. But Paul is not arguing for universal salvation, he is arguing only for universal resurrection. On the one side physical death passed upon all men in the sin of Adam, on the other physical life was restored to all men in the obedience of Jesus Christ. If Dr Denney's theory may be described as immoral, Professor Peake's theory must surely be called unmoral.

What is the value of it? Professor Peake is not very explicit, for it is his business in this article to vindicate the use of 'a racial act' as a description of the act of Christ's Atonement. But we think he means that the union with Christ which secures the resurrection from the dead has nothing to do with the believer's personal faith. Christ is one with the race, and that oneness carries with it the resur-

rection of the body. But He who is one with the race is the Holy One of God. The sinner looks. He sees one who is bone of his bone, wholly acceptable to God. He clings to Him. That act of self-surrender forms the higher union of will. He too is accepted in the Beloved.

Still Professor Peake claims that his view of the death of Christ does not make the death of Christ a purely physical thing, with purely physical effects. For physical death was the doing of sin. Release from physical death is release from the overwhelming tyranny of sin. The man who knows that he died when Christ died, knows that sin has not now its old *dominion* over him. By destroying death Christ destroyed him that had the power of death, that is the devil. Now he is free, not from the presence of sin, but from its dominion, and he can look to Christ and be saved.

'There is no outstanding event in the life of our Lord so disappointing as the Transfiguration. It seems so great: we get so little out of it.'

Since those words were written in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for October a number of communications on the Transfiguration have reached us. They have come from men who are not disappointed, from men (and women) who have got much out of the Transfiguration. Well, we did not mean to say that the Transfiguration was a disappointment to everybody. The 'we' was neither editorial nor universal. It covered an ordinary experience only. To most ordinary men the Transfiguration seemed to promise much and yield little.

Those communications are being kept for the present. They will be dealt with. But we have discovered a sermon on the Transfiguration, which has to be taken by itself. It is not a speculative sermon; it is practical. No effort is made to declare in it all that the writer has found in the Transfiguration. But the insight cannot be hid. The writer is Professor A. B. Davidson.

The sermon is found in the middle of the new volume of sermons, *The Called of God* (T. & T. Clark ; 6s.). It is chosen, not because it is exceptional in the volume, or specially characteristic. One of the Old Testament sermons might have been more characteristic—the sermon on the Servant of the Lord, the sermon on David Repentant ('Davidson on the 51st Psalm' it might be called), the sermon on Job and his Redeemer ('I know that my Redeemer liveth'). It is chosen simply because it is on the Transfiguration.

It is a practical sermon. Dr. Davidson called it so himself: 'My object is to make two or three practical remarks.' We shall come to them. But on the way to them we are arrested by the fact itself. 'He was transfigured before them.' What transfigured Him? It was His own mind, says Davidson. It was something that was going on within Him. It covered His face, it shone upon His clothing, it transfigured His whole person. His clothes became white, exceeding white as snow, so as no fuller on earth could white them. The fashion of His countenance was altered. And it all came from within. It was not a reflected glory. Moses did not bring it with him, nor Elijah. 'We must by all means hold that the external change that passed upon Him was but the reflection of movements in His own mind and heart going on at the moment.'

These movements of His mind had to do with His death. That is made clear beyond all question. And the immediate occasion was prayer. It was while He held communion with the Father on the subject of His death that the fashion of His countenance was altered. Was it the joy set before Him, then? Joy is said to make the face to shine. Sorrow is said to darken the countenance. No, it was the death itself, and the death was too near. His death was a death of sorrow. There was no sorrow like unto His.

But sorrow does not always darken the countenance. 'There is often,' says Dr. Davidson, 'a

deeper joy in sorrow, the feeling as of a new birth and a new consecration, and of a refining and quickening of all that is highest in us, and an enlarging of the meaning of all things and of human life, that causes the face to shine with a subdued but heavenly light.' If joy makes the face to shine, the joy that rises out of the deepest sorrow transfigures the countenance.

What was the thought that caused the radiance? We need not fix it down to any single thought. It was rather 'that indescribable tumultuous crowding of emotions which rushed into His heart, as He lay on His Father's bosom, and saw, now standing close before Him, His death and all its meaning.' And yet Dr. Davidson sees two unmistakable elements in it.

The first was love. 'We have seen the radiance of a human love that bends over and falls on the worn face of a sick child. What would be the radiance of the love of the Son of Man falling upon the face of a sick and restless world?' The second was suffering. 'Suffering gives men a dignity. We go into it with a firm step and a light in the countenance; the loftiness of the resolution lightens up the face, and deeper feelings of many kinds rush into the mind, and look out from the countenance.' The hour of Christ's suffering was at hand. He was about to set His face steadfastly to go to Jerusalem. The glory which the three saw who were with Him in the holy mount was outward and visible, but it came from within. It was due to the resolution to go to Jerusalem, taken in the act of prayer.

'We beheld His glory,' says one of them. There are few great words so meaningless to us as this word glory. 'We beheld His glory'—it was at first only the outward splendour, for we may be sure John saw no more than Peter saw. So to us even yet, glory is outward show, splendour, magnificence merely. 'Solomon in all his glory' is our favourite recollection.

But when Moses desired to see the glory of God, God said, 'I will make all my *goodness* pass before thee.' What would a blinding show of dazzling brilliance have done for Moses? 'I will make all my goodness pass before thee.' That is to see the glory of God; to see how good He is. And that is to glorify God—to let others see how good God is.

And the highest manifestation of goodness we call love. So when Jesus was about to leave the earth, going the way of the malefactor, He would strengthen the disciples for the shock. Will He dazzle them with the show of another 'Solomon in all his glory'? 'Father,' He prayed, 'glorify thou me, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was; for thou *lovedest* me before the foundation of the world.' Let them see that I love and am loved again—that is My glory. Let them know that no man taketh My life from Me, but I lay it down of Myself, that the Father loveth Me because I lay down My life for the sheep.

And when St. Paul would express to the Colossians how great was the destiny in store for them, he said, 'this mystery—Christ in you the hope of glory.' Did he mean that Christ in them was their assurance of salvation, their assurance of getting to heaven? St. Paul was not content with so poor an expectation as that. The wonder was—the mystery of it—that these men and women of Colossæ, so recently aliens from God, so crammed with evils still, would yet be so good, would yet love so unselfishly, that when men regarded them they would see their glory. Christ in you; it was all in that. Christ in you transforming your character, changing you into the same image from glory to glory, till it be said even of you selfish and sinful Gentiles, 'greater love have no men than these.'

Return now to the Transfiguration. The glory, says Davidson, was from within. It could only be from within with Him, as properly speaking it can only be from without to us. For the highest

manifestation of love is God's, and is ours through 'Christ in us.' But when it is from without its value is in its being made ours within; and when it is from within, as with Him, it must express itself without. 'We beheld His glory'—we saw the inward become outward, we saw His love for a sinful world, His sorrow in the advent of the cross—we saw it all in His transfigured face, in His raiment white as snow.

Thus the Transfiguration is also very practical. Looking at it as he could see it, Davidson says, 'My object is to make two or three practical remarks.' This is the real difficulty of the Transfiguration, how to make it practical. For the most part we are confined to the contrast between the glory on the mount and the lunatic child's shame below. Davidson does not forget that contrast. But that is to emphasize the absence of the practical from the Transfiguration; it is to say that to be up in the mount is not to be practical, that to do your work you must descend to the plain.

Dr. Davidson has some practical remarks to make on the Transfiguration itself. The first is this. If we are to see anything of the glory of Christ, or of Christ in His glory, we must go apart with Christ. He does sometimes—Dr. Davidson admits it—reveal Himself in the crowd and in the business of daily life. He did so to Zacchæus. But that is rarely. Even to Zacchæus, 'the full view that turned the rich publican into a liberal disciple was reserved for his own house.' What did He take the disciples into the mount for? First of all that they might be apart with Him. Knowledge comes that way. It is in the letters written in prison that St. Paul uses the verb *to know*, that he speaks of 'the excellency of the *knowledge* of Christ Jesus my Lord.'

The second practical remark is this. If Christ was transfigured by fellowship with the Father, we may be transfigured by fellowship with Christ. 'The greatness of the issues, and the thoughts

that have been engaging us, will reduce to nothing the facts of life. We shall move among men with serenity, but with sympathy, tender-hearted, kindly-affectioned, forbearing and forgiving, not readily ruffled, smoothing away irritations with a patient hand, meek, doing good as we have opportunity, not thinking this life too mean to attend to, but lifting it up, and filling all its offices with love.'

Jesus was transfigured on the mount. The disciples were not transfigured there. Their transfiguration came after they descended to the plain and began to heal the sick and preach the gospel to the poor. They had to set their goodness awork, before men recognized it as goodness and called it glory. But they got the spirit of goodness on the mount; and all the while it was through fellowship with Jesus that their work on the plain became goodness and glory. 'As though by our own power or godliness we had made him to walk!'

And the last practical remark is this. That Christ took the disciples with Him in order that He might not be alone. He cannot bear to be alone. Before He became incarnate He kept coming unto His own, because He cannot bear to be alone. And it was because His own received

Him not, and there was the danger that after all He would have to be alone, that He became flesh and dwelt among us.

Now, says Dr. Davidson, this idea is one we like to dwell upon. For there is no more oppressive or paralysing thought than one that sometimes overcomes us, the thought of the utter nothingness of ourselves and of our life. What do we accomplish? What fruit or gain is there of our lives and the way we spend them? We walk upon the summer road, and see some ant tugging towards the common heap a husk. If it reaches the heap, it will increase it by a husk. But the life of man is not as the life of the ant, increasing the heap by a husk. Christ came to give man's work its worth. He came not to supersede men, but to perfect them. No effort is lost; no man who does work is lost. The effort is perfected in Christ's work, and the man stands beside Him, his fashion brought out by the very light of Christ's glory. For He cannot be alone. He takes them with Him, that He may not be alone. And it is Christ's own glory that shall lighten up on that day when 'they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament, and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars, for ever and ever.'

The General Synod of the Evangelical Church of Prussia of the Year 1903.

BY PROFESSOR ED. KÖNIG, PH.D., D.D., BONN.

THE General Synod of the Evangelical Church of Prussia, which recently held its sittings in Berlin for three weeks (from 15th October to 4th November), meets every six years. The very rarity of its meetings thus lends importance to this Assembly. What a number of difficulties waiting to be solved are apt to accumulate during a single year of the existence of any considerable society. How much greater must be the sum total of wishes that are formed in the course of six years, and that

hope to find expression by the mouth of the General Synod! Another circumstance that gives weight to this Assembly is the nature of its composition. It is made up of laymen and theologians. The former class includes a large number of the leading officials of State; a Minister, several Presidents of the Provinces, Generals, and others. The theologians, again, that are members of the General Synod, are partly clergymen of every grade, up to that of General-Superintendent, and partly

professors, representing the different Faculties. The present writer, for instance, had the honour of representing the Evangelical Faculty of the University of Bonn. The significance of the latest gathering of the General Synod was very greatly heightened by the importance of the subjects brought under its consideration. Accordingly, the editor of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES has very kindly allowed me to give to its readers some account of the recent proceedings of that Assembly.

1. One of the first subjects of deliberation concerned the *external situation* of the Evangelical Church of Prussia. The latter has never ceased to suffer from the circumstance that at the beginning of last century, when 'the Holy Roman Empire of the German nation' was dissolved, many possessions of the Church were secularized. Then, when Prussia had emerged victorious from the severe struggles with Napoleon, the Roman Catholic Church of Prussia secured a rich compensation, a result quite in accordance with the energy and cleverness which this Church always exhibits in external matters. But the Evangelical Church of Prussia then received 228,000,000 marks (£11,400,000) too little. This was testified to in a public sitting of the Prussian Chamber by no less a one than Dr. Bosse, the former Minister of Ecclesiastical Affairs of Prussia. It is true that during the last decades much has been done to heal this wound. In particular, the liberal hand of the Emperor William II., with his warmly Evangelical sympathies, has placed copious funds at the disposal of the Evangelical Church, and Her Majesty the Empress is the noble patroness of a Society for building churches. The efforts of this Society have led to the erecting of a great many, especially in the rapidly growing city of Berlin. Notwithstanding all this, there are still many congregations, notably in the eastern provinces, which are very anxious to obtain new or enlarged buildings for purposes of worship. These wishes met with the strongest sympathy from the members of the General Synod, and their realization may be hoped for, seeing that on the very day of its opening the Synod was surprised by the announcement of His Imperial Majesty's resolution that clergyman of the Evangelical Church are in future to be exempted from payments to the fund from which they and their survivors draw pensions. A great step towards securing the comfort of the ministers of the Evangelical Church of Prussia has thus been

taken once more, and that is not a matter of indifference. For, while we should not like to see those who serve the Church making the faithfulness of their service depend exactly upon the measure of their recompense, it is true, on the other hand, that Christ's words, 'The labourer is worthy of his hire,' involve a social principle which cannot be permanently neglected with impunity.

2. Turning now to the *internal* Christian life, it was a principal task of the General Synod to determine more precisely the right attitude of the organized Church to various 'associations' (the so-called *Gemeinschaftsleute*). For a number of years it has been the way in Germany that here and there within the regularly constituted congregations there have been formed smaller bodies. Now no one will deny that, in view of the abnormal growth of many congregations, a closer union of persons of like dispositions responds to a natural need of the human heart. The members of a small body of this kind easily come to know one another, become acquainted with mutual needs, and are ready to help each other in trouble and to comfort in sorrow. But, on the other hand, it cannot be denied that among the causes that have co-operated in the forming of such associations have been the aim at something peculiar, and the influence of foreign, especially American, preachers. At all events, it may be observed that these new bodies affect a peculiar form of many doctrines, and set up a strange ideal of morality. For instance, one speaker in the General Synod told how an agent of these associations, in addressing a meeting, called out to a man in the audience: 'You will be damned, for you have your idols in your breast-pocket; your cigars are your idols'! This is a specimen of the favouring of a false ideal of Christian morality which prevails in such societies; and if an inclination to false views, like those of the Darbyites, is associated with this, it can readily be understood how not a few friends of the sound Evangelical faith see in those associations an imminent danger. Hence many speakers, as, for instance, General-Superintendent Braun of Königsberg, very emphatically recommended that the most prudent reserve should be cultivated towards such bodies.

3. Another subject of very serious deliberation was the relation of the Church to a number of practical results of modern culture. To this category belongs in some measure the question of the

Church's attitude to *duelling*, and it was a stirring hour when it came on for debate. But, in spite of the attempt of certain gentlemen of noble birth to represent the duel as a species of self-defence, or a kind of judicial action, it was almost unanimously agreed that '*duelling is sinful.*'

Difference of opinion arose more naturally on the question of how clergymen should act in connexion with the obsequies of persons who in their last will had expressed a wish that their remains should be *cremated*. The Synod of the province of Rheinland, to which the town of Bonn belongs, brought forward a proposal that the clergy in their official costume should be at liberty to deliver a consolatory address to the surviving relatives before the conveying of the corpse to the crematorium. But even the eloquent words of Dr. Hackenberg, who counselled wisdom, justice, and love towards those left behind, failed to move the majority of the General Synod to accept the proposal of the Synod of the province of Rheinland. It was generally feared that, if a concession were made on this point, the spirit of the present age would end with the demand that the clergy should bless even the urns containing the ashes.

The greatest anxiety was caused to the General Synod by the mass of unbelief embodied in *Social Democracy* and opposed to the Church. At the famous Congress recently held at Dresden this party declared itself to be as bitter a foe of Christianity as of the State. How then is the danger to be conjured away which threatens the Church from these un-Christianized circles? This question was earnestly discussed in the debates of the General Synod, and an important conclusion was arrived at. *For the first time* a resolution was passed that part of the Church revenues should be devoted to the following two purposes. In the first place, preachers are to be set apart to attend to the spiritual welfare of working class families, which stream towards the great industrial centres and form a more or less fluctuating population. Secondly, measures are to be taken whereby students of theology and clergymen shall receive instruction on the Social Question, so that they may understand and be prepared to combat the threatening danger. The new century thus marks in this regard also an important stage of development.

4. The weightiest matter, however, that engaged the attention of the General Synod was undoubtedly

what has been called for shortness the 'Professors' Question.' This is the problem of how to satisfy at one and the same time the demands of Science and of the Church in the teaching of theology in the Universities. The proceedings with reference to this point were opened with a speech delivered by Professor Erich Haupt (of Halle) at one of the first full sittings. His speech ended with a motion to pass, for reasons assigned, to the order of the day. But although these reasons included a testimony to Jesus Christ the Risen Saviour, the expression 'pass to the order of the day' was felt to be so objectionable that the majority would not venture to carry back such a resolution to their sorely disturbed provinces. Hence the matter was remitted for consideration to a committee of twenty-one members. The greater number of these were of opinion that the Evangelical theology may be supported in its self-defence against modern views by the following two measures. In the first place, an aim would be made at strengthening the influence of the Church upon the nomination to theological professorships, namely, through the Synodal element (the President, etc., of the General Synod) being required to have a voice in this. Secondly, a proposal was mooted to secure in a new way—by methods to be freshly devised—the habilitation of suitable young theologians who are to be engaged as pastors. The present writer was one of those selected for this committee, and he delivered to it the address which is summarized in what follows, and which gives expression to the fundamental notion which, since his habilitation, has been his ideal and regulating principle.

At the outset I referred to some extreme positions of modern theology, which in my opinion are irreconcilable with biblical religion and are thus of course to be deplored. Not a few theologians at the present day, I pointed out, have come to accept a purely analytical theology, holding it possible to resolve religion into a psychological process and to characterize even Christianity as a stage in the general religious development of the human race. Thus, I went on, the picture which may be drawn of the present condition of theological science contains undoubtedly not a few dark features, and it cannot be wondered at that many of our contemporaries should see in these dark spots storm-clouds which threaten to cover the whole horizon and to discharge blazing thunderbolts at the edifice of Christ's kingdom. But how

is this well-grounded and widespread anxiety in face of an imminent danger to be dispelled? This question, I added, had led, as my hearers were aware, large numbers within the Church to put forward two main proposals for improving the present situation. But I argued that the principal flaw in these methods was their probable fruitlessness.

Previous speakers had spoken of the inutility of the proposed participation of the President, etc., of the General Synod in the nomination of theological professors; and I confessed that I was in agreement with them. For the judgment of the President at the time a professor was called to office would not necessarily be valid for the whole period of that professor's tenure of office. The President's judgment, to be of enduring value, must be supplemented by constant surveillance and, if necessary, by deposition of the professor in question. As to the other plan proposed, namely, that of adopting new methods whereby a preference would be given to one class of young candidates for habilitation, I expressed my inability to see in it any surer means of improving the present situation. Might not these young men afterwards abandon their original standpoint? Besides, if no support were given except to young theologians with biblical leanings, would complaints not arise over the preference given to one party? My main objection, however, to the proposed plan was that it amounted at bottom to *a confession of the poverty of the body of truth contained in the Christian religion*. And yet for centuries the facts and ideas of Christianity had drawn youthful spirits to consecrate their life to its full understanding. The unique position of the Old Testament religion in the midst of ancient culture, and the indescribable majesty of the dazzling figure of Jesus Christ, had in past centuries *sufficed of themselves* to attract spirits to such a degree that they found their ideal in an academical course and within a Theological Faculty. Hitherto the truths contained in Christianity had proved *as* attractive as the objects of investigation in the other Faculties. Why should this power of attraction on the part of Christian truth be now called in question? Why should it in future have aid offered to it? Was there anything in the other Faculties quite analogous to what was proposed? But unless everything was avoided that would tend to place the Theological Faculty in an exceptional position

as compared with the others, the influence of that Faculty would be diminished, a result against which there was no need to warn my hearers, for it was one that could not but be unwelcome to them all. Those who were members of the Theological Faculties should aim at winning over all circles of their contemporaries, and especially the representatives of the other Faculties, by showing them that even a friend of free science may stand independently and from inmost conviction upon the ground of Christianity. But any such influence on the part of the Theological Faculties would be prevented if habilitation in a Theological Faculty were to become an exceptional act through being subjected to outside influences. Full consideration had led me to the conclusion that all *external* measures whereby the character of academic theology might appear to be altered, ought to be avoided.

I explained that I had been all the more strengthened in this opinion by the reflexion that it is no *necessary* result of the hitherto prevailing conditions of life of the theological science of the Universities, that in the persons of some of its representatives it has assumed a hostile attitude to the fundamental truths of the Bible. It is by no means the case that *all* representatives of theological science share in this opposition. Hence there is no necessity for *altering* the conditions under which theological science has hitherto existed. All that is needed is to insist upon the correct observing of these conditions. This appeared to me, I declared, the only possible conclusion, and it was one for which I considered that strong support could be brought forward.

The fundamental condition of existence of theological science, namely, *freedom of research*, is, I pointed out, not something altogether vague and incomprehensible. It is not bounded, indeed, by distance, or by anything outside itself, but is limited, in the first place, by *the subject of investigation itself*. The process of investigation is primarily determined by the necessity of taking an all-round view of the matter to be examined, instead of contenting oneself with looking at one side only. *All* its characteristics must be kept in view with equal earnestness. To take an illustration from my own department, it was quite natural that, after centuries of domination of the Jewish-Christian tradition as to literary questions in the O.T., the *first* glances should be turned on those

features which broke the spell of tradition. But gradually the time comes when the other side also attracts the eye, and the same interest is accorded to everything in the O.T. books that speaks in favour of the authority of tradition.¹

The second consideration that imposes a limit upon freedom of research I found in the *conscientiousness of the investigator*. This shows itself not only in an all-round examination of the subject of investigator, but in the self-criticism of the investigator, in the mutual criticisms of different investigators, and, in the impartial examination of the results reached by those who belong to a different school of the particular branch of science.

As to the investigator's *self-criticism*, we must be always on our guard against taking half-proofs of an assertion for complete ones. To take an illustration from the sphere of linguistic argumentation, with which I have been specially engaged since my habilitation—how often it has happened that a difference in particular lexical expressions has been treated as a proof of difference of authorship! And yet I showed long ago that this is an insufficient evidence. Away then with the adding together of half-arguments as if the sum total could yield cogent proofs!

Again, the *mutual criticism* of investigators must be carried on in a dignified manner, and not with recriminations *a limine*. It has repeatedly happened, however, in recent times, that an attempt has been made by contemptuous treatment to stultify the arguments of scholars who have ventured to assume an independent position. How Friedrich Delitzsch, for instance, has gone out of his way to insult his opponents with irrelevant remarks! Hence no more earnest wish can be expressed than that all these *internal* limits to freedom of research should always be observed on all sides. Would that a serious effort were made once more to apply this standard to decide whether there is any real justification for many of the theories wherewith some of the latest representatives of theology oppose the saving truths of the Bible! If only the *investigator* would not start such theories, the *teacher* would have no occasion to put them forward as serious assertions.

I closed with an earnest appeal to leave the old conditions of life of academic theology undisturbed. With the same weapons and under the same rules

of combat as the other Faculties we desire to continue our stand in the arena, and to carry the royal cause of Christianity to a triumphant issue.

My words did not, however, quite allay the storm. The demand that the President, etc., of the General Synod should 'in suitable cases' (*in geeigneten Fällen*) participate in the nomination to theological professorships was renewed from one side of the house. The above-mentioned plan in regard to the habilitation of younger clerics was approved of by the same party, and the same majority proposed a resolution in these terms: 'The hope is expressed that none will be called to be professors except men who believe in and confess the Son of God.' Almost exactly a third, namely, fifty-nine members, of the General Synod declined to assent to these resolutions, notwithstanding the deep conviction of the fundamental truths of Scripture which most of them feel. The Government, moreover, which makes the appointments to professorships, is not likely to lend its aid to any attempt to alter the existing condition of the Theological Faculties in the German Universities.

5. Finally, it was natural that the proceedings of the General Synod should take account of the mutual relations of the different *Confessions*. Passing over complaints of the intolerance of the Roman Catholics, I mention only one notable resolution that was proposed regarding the *Jesuits*. To understand it little explanation is needed, for it is no doubt well known that in certain circles in Germany a disposition has not been wanting to annul sec. 2 of the Jesuit Law, which enacts that members of the Society of Jesus shall not be allowed to live within the bounds of the German Empire, except on the footing of individual foreigners, and only in certain specified places. This disposition met with strenuous opposition in the General Synod, and a motion was carried, with very few dissenting voices, that sec. 2 ought to remain in force.

Looking back on these recent sittings of the General Synod, one feels that their outcome must be pronounced satisfactory. The fundamental confession of Evangelical Christianity found powerful expression. The attacks of opponents of our Saviour were sharply warded off without the hand of reconciliation being drawn back. The only point where a lack of clear insight was shown, was in connexion with the problem of how to define correctly the bounds of Christian theology.

¹ Cf. my recent brochure, *Glaubwürdigkeitsspur des A. T.* Berlin: Runge. 75 pfennigs.

Old Testament Prophecy.

BY THE REV. J. A. SELBIE, D.D., MARYCULTER.

THE indirect influence which the late Professor A. B. Davidson exercised upon the religious community, mainly through those who had been his pupils in Edinburgh New College, is being powerfully reinforced by his posthumous works. The impression produced by that remarkable volume of sermons entitled *The Called of God* is still fresh in our minds when we have put into our hands a publication¹ (see title below) whose appearance has been awaited with only less eagerness than that with which we still look for the promised volume on *O.T. Theology*.

Hebrew Prophecy is a subject of which Dr. Davidson was in a special sense the master. His article on 'Prophecy and Prophets' in the fourth volume of the *Dictionary of the Bible* is regarded by many as the article in that volume. The present work contains twenty-four Lectures, taken, as the editor informs us, direct from the manuscript used by the author in his classes up to the last. It is thus claimed for them that they embody his latest views. In the absence of any clue [but surely this could have been obtained from the note-books of students] to the order in which they were delivered, the editor has given them an order which 'seems quite natural and sufficiently logical,' and 'it is believed that they have been put into something like the sequence in which they were originally given.' 'In all probability [we should say "most assuredly"] the whole series, as now published, was never read to any one class . . . he must have been in the habit of selecting sometimes one branch of the subject and sometimes another for full treatment, and then going rapidly over the rest, as time permitted.'

Chap. i. deals with 'Prophecy as a factor in human history.' On p. 3 there are some striking and helpful remarks on what is a stumbling-block to some, God's special choice of Israel—

'I think some of our confusion of thought and misapprehension of God's ways to man has arisen from failing to

conceive the unity of the human race, and to regard the Jewish people as merely the point of union, merely the elevated conducting-rod, so to speak, pointing to heaven, and drawing down an influence to be distributed speedily over the whole earth. . . . The choice was not of them exclusive of humanity, but of them as a part of humanity—as a type of humanity—as the leaven of humanity—in a word, a choice, not of them to the exclusion of humanity, but a choice of humanity as included in them. The choice of the Jews was no more exclusive of the human race than the choice of the man Abraham was exclusive of the Jewish nation; the whole development was included in the original germ.'

Passing in chap. ii. to deal with 'Prophecy as the dominating factor in Israel's history from the time of Moses onwards,' Dr. Davidson discovers three critical periods in the history of the nation from the Exodus to the Exile: (1) the close of the period of the Judges, marked by the career of *Samuel*; (2) the crisis in the Northern kingdom, caused by the introduction of the worship of the Zidonian Baal, whose great opponent was *Elijah*; (3) the closing years of the kingdom of Judah, signalized by the career of *Jeremiah*. The following chapters (iii.–vi.) sketch the history of prophecy (which is practically the history of religion) in the time of Deborah, of Samuel and Saul, of David, of Elijah and onwards. The name 'prophet' and its definition are discussed in chap. vii. The *nēbîm* of the time of Samuel have justice done to them as something superior to the howling dervishes of Islam, while inferior to Samuel himself. The true prophet unites in himself the following characteristics: 'a man of God, a servant of Jehovah, a messenger of God, an interpreter of God, a seer of the things of God, a speaker of the things of God to man' (p. 89). In this connexion we come upon one of those striking passages which light up the pages and arrest the attention of the readers of Dr. Davidson—

'Perhaps the days of prophecy are over now. Truth has been won—it has appeared. The veil has been torn from God's face. One has lived who said, "I am the Truth," "He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father." Prophecy culminated and perhaps really expired in the Prophet of Nazareth. Yet the history of prophecy renews itself in the individual soul at least many times. There is the dawning of truth, awful or beautiful, the corresponding excitation, the growing of the light until at last God's face is seen in

¹ *Old Testament Prophecy*. By the late A. B. Davidson, D.D., LL.D., Litt.D., Professor of Hebrew, New College, Edinburgh. Edited by J. A. Paterson, D.D., Professor of Hebrew, New College, Edinburgh. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1903. Price 10s. 6d. net.

peace. But just as here, so it was in prophecy. Excitation was no essential of it, neither was the abstracted state or vision. The first prophet and the last, like unto him, seem both to have received and to have uttered truth with a calm demeanour free from all perturbation of mind or excitement of manner. Truth came to them through no medium. Its rays were pure. One was Himself the Truth, and with the other God spake face to face. So, too, the one was comparatively pure spirit, and the other perfectly. The rays of truth passed from their minds suffering no refraction; and, when truth entered, it found no incongruous elements, and there followed no disturbance. But with other men that could not yet be' (p. 88).

In chap. viii. ('The position of the prophet in the State') the difficult question is touched upon, how the true prophets of Jehovah had the assurance that the word they spoke was His. And, after a careful examination, the conclusion is reached that their assurance was not different in kind from what believers experience now. 'The prophet who was really moved by the Spirit knew certainly that he was so, the prophet who was not so moved might imagine himself to be. . . . It is quite incredible that the numerous class of prophets who were undoubtedly false were all intentionally so.' This last statement is fully substantiated in a later chapter (xvii.). In chap. ix. the reader will find all that is necessary on 'The prophetic state,' including such conditions as ecstasy, the vision, etc. Dr. Davidson appears to have deliberately ignored the 'cataleptic theory' of Klostermann, Duhm, and others. In dealing with 'Prophetic style,' and 'The interpretation of natural symbolism in prophecy,' Dr. Davidson is not a whit too severe in denouncing the method of prophetic interpretation which in its mechanical prosaic fashion destroys the poetical imagery of the prophets and allegorizes the symbolism of nature into human relations (e.g. making mountains = worldly kingdoms, stars = ruling powers, *et hoc genus omne absurdum*). Specially worthy of study are chaps. xiii. ('Typology in nature and revelation') and xiv. ('Typology in Scripture'). The mysteries of those often misapplied terms, 'type' and 'anti-type' are thoroughly cleared up; and the predictive element in the Scripture types is conclusively shown to have lain in their *imperfection*.

'The Isaianic problem' is discussed in chap. xv. with a conclusiveness which will confirm those who are already convinced of the truth of the critical theory of a Deutero-Isaiah, and which, along with the conciliatory and painstaking manner

of the argument, should at least disarm hostile prejudice, if it does not wholly persuade unbelief.

Passing over the classification of the Canonical prophets (chap. xvi.), and the chapter on 'False prophets,' we come to what to many will appear the most important part of the book, chaps. xviii.-xxiii., treating respectively of 'Messianic prophecy,' 'The various kinds of Messianic prophecy,' 'The Messianic King,' 'Deutero-Isaiah's outlook on the future,' 'The Servant of the Lord,' 'The work of the Servant of the Lord.' Here Dr. Davidson is at his best throughout, treading the most difficult paths with sure step, and leading us to conclusions which are at once just to the historical interpretation of the Old Testament and to its fulfilment in the New Dispensation. This is specially evident in his treatment of the great problem of the 'Servant of the Lord.' In agreement with Budde, Ed. König, and other notable Old Testament scholars, he finds insuperable objections to the view that the Servant is thought of by the prophet as an individual, whether contemporary or future. His own view of the prophet's conception of the Servant is stated thus—

'He is, first, Israel under certain conceptions, chosen of the Lord and endowed with the knowledge of His word, and therefore His servant, His prophet, and messenger to the nations.

'Then this conception, abstracted from the individuals in Israel who were not true to it, is personified and treated by the prophet as a Being, a true Divine creation. This is the servant Israel, always existing within the mass of individuals in Israel, a hidden man of the heart in Israel all through its history. . . . This true Israel was at all times represented by Israelites. It was not a mere conception. The conception had embodiments in saints and prophets and martyrs for the truth. It testified and it suffered; it sank into despondency as if labouring in vain, and yet in the saddest and darkest moments of its history it set its face as a flint, knowing that He was near that should justify it. . . . The description of the sufferings of this servant is given chiefly in chap. 53. . . . The individual aspect of the servant is much stronger here than elsewhere. This was natural. Because here the servant is contrasted with Israelites and not with the heathen. . . . It was quite natural that the prophet's ideal Being should become more and more individual in his hands, as he concentrated his mind upon it and more and more realized the moral elements in his creation.

'To the prophet . . . gathering up all the sorrows together, the patience, the meekness, the teaching, the sufferings unto death of godly men, the body of the servant incarnated, it was as if this person, always incarnate in Israel, had borne the sins of the individuals, and they were redeemed.

' . . . The prophet conceived himself standing at the end

of Israel's history, with only one momentum of it now to occur, the restoration and final felicity in God's presence.

'We know that Israel's history had not then ended. But the moral conditions of its taking end, which the prophet perceived, are true conditions. The real end will correspond to the ideal. We are already able to see his conceptions verified. The necessity of the redemptive history, that sins should be borne, has been satisfied. One truly corresponding to the prophet's ideal Being, the Divine in Israel incarnated, sinless and suffering for the sins of the people, has taken their sins away.

'... The Christian solution is already here in its conceptions. And it is here, though not absolutely in the Christian form, in a form not far from it—in a form as near it as could be expected in this age with its necessities; for one of the necessities of this age, as of all ages of the history of the people of God, was that they should feel that they had a *present* redemption. For the ancient Scripture was written not entirely for us, but for the ancient people; and the prophet throws the Christian ideas into the living history of that time, making the people see them embodied there, and enabling them to feel that salvation was a thing real to them in their own day.'

Finally, chap. xxiv., on the 'Restoration of the Jews,' is one to which not a few will turn with interest to learn what are the conclusions of so cautious and sober an inquirer on a question which has occasioned such numerous and hot controversies.

Turning to the editing of these lectures, we have to say that, upon the lines on which he has chosen to work, Professor Paterson has done his work well. Perhaps he might have done better. No doubt, the publication of posthumous lectures, especially lectures by one like Professor Davidson, is a somewhat delicate task. We can very well understand Professor Paterson's reluctance to take any liberty with the materials at his disposal, or to obtrude his own personality between Dr. Davidson and his readers. It may be questioned, however, whether those scruples have not weighed with him to the extent of robbing the book of that finish and well-rounded character which Dr. Davidson would certainly have given to it *as a book*, had it been published in his lifetime. Each lecture being in a sense complete in itself, a certain amount of overlapping was inevitable, and to this we have no objection. In fact, some of the points discussed are so complicated and many-sided that the reader is benefited by having them presented over and over again, and in different aspects. But there are instances where clearness and consistency would have been promoted by slight omissions or additions, or modifications, which could have been

accomplished without any disloyalty to Professor Davidson. Such changes, we feel certain, would have been made by the author himself. At the very least we should have expected an editorial note here and there to prevent misunderstandings. As Professor Paterson very justly remarks in his preface, 'these lectures may be read with pleasure and profit by educated laymen, who have no acquaintance with the Hebrew language.' Now, we will suppose such a reader anxious to learn what Professor Davidson has to say about the predictive element in prophecy. Well, here are three pronouncements on the subject—

'Prophecy is not identical with *prediction*. Prediction is the least element in it. *I do not know that it is an essential element in it at all*' (p. 11).—'The prophet was essentially a *man of the present*, conditioned in his deliverances by the necessities of his time, to which he applied general principles of truth, and only lifting the veil of the future when it was needful to cheer or soberize the hearts of his contemporaries by the sight of what should certainly come' (p. 91).—'The *essence of prophecy is prediction*—prediction not only of the far distant consummation and glory of the kingdom, but also of the nearer steps necessary to this' (p. 294).

We do not imply for a moment that there is any real contradiction involved in those various statements, but there is enough of the appearance of it to justify the question, 'How shall he that occupieth the room of the unlearned say Amen?' We think it only due to the weak brother that even the risk of his stumbling should be removed. And we are certain that the way to this could be discovered without much difficulty.

On one or two subordinate points Professor Davidson had a slight surprise in store for us. Twice at least he speaks of *Samuel* as well as Samson as a Nazirite. Again, the worship conducted in the temple at Shiloh, and afterwards at Jerusalem, is spoken of without hesitation as *imageless*. We wonder if he maintained to the last this opinion, against which so much can be said. A conclusion in which we find it impossible, with all the good will in the world, to agree with him, is that there is no great divergence between the two accounts given in 1 Samuel of the introduction of the kingship. Is it quite fair again, to acquit David of any supposed scandal in connexion with the presence of *tērāphim* in his house, and to throw all the blame on his wife? Few, we imagine, will be disposed to follow Professor Davidson in his identification of the four empires of Daniel with the Babylonian, the Medo-Persian, the empire of

Alexander and his four generals, and the Seleucid empire.

These lectures contain fewer examples than we should have expected of that dry humour and pungent sarcasm of which Dr. Davidson could avail himself so readily. But they are not wanting. For instance, regarding those who hold that the Servant of the Lord in Isaiah stands for some individual of the time, he remarks that 'such opinions are valuable only as a kind of guide to the mental character of their authors, which they do not tend to set in a very favourable light.' Dealing, again, with those who insist at all costs on the *literal* fulfilment of certain prophecies, he says:

'Of the persons who so speak, we must say that they sacrifice their reason to their faith; and they probably injure the truth more by their irrationality than they advance it by the spectacle of their faith.'

But in the atmosphere in which this book places us, it seems almost profane to touch on petty details of the work of either the author or the editor. It is a book to which we shall return again and again, to hold communion with one whose spiritual insight into the phenomenon of prophecy is so profound, and whose language is always worthy of its subject. Nowhere have the prophets of Israel found so sympathetic an exponent as in these lectures of Professor Davidson.

At the Literary Table.

The Code of Hammurabi.¹

THIS is a very able and welcome book. Mr. Cook takes his stand upon the critical view of sources in the Pentateuch. Although he claims no independent knowledge of Assyrian, by which he means that he has not done any work on cuneiform tablets, yet he is thoroughly conversant with published Assyriological works, and uses the best results with singularly little misconception. He practically gives the whole of the Code in quotations, with the transcribed Babylonian text of the original. Hence any student who wants to know what the Code says on any one point, can have the full information by turning to the index. This is a very great advantage. Alongside the relevant portions of the Code are set biblical parallels. The other ancient codes of law, and especially the very interesting Roman Syrian law book of the fifth century, are quoted in illustration.

Mr. Cook has also made an excellent beginning on the only useful method of ascertaining the real meaning of the Code. He has collected from all available sources the data afforded by the very numerous legal documents contemporary with the Code, or later. This he has done with surprising skill. The value of this kind of evidence is in-

estimable, and it is a grave fault that so many editors of the Code seem to be unaware of its existence. If we had it not, we might be tormented by doubts whether the Code was ever more than a literary document. They prove that it was an integral part of the daily life of the people, and that it was practically the law of the land unchanged to the end of Babylonian history.

It is rather a pleasant sensation to read a book which contends for the value of the Israelite tradition. The once dreaded critical school are now an orthodoxy, and defend their views against the new attack of the Babylonizers. They do so with consummate skill. Mr. Cook finds very little, if anything, in the Hebrew laws which can be regarded as borrowed from the Code of Hammurabi. He does indeed consider that for its bearing upon the laws of the Old Testament, the Code exceeds in value even the discoveries of Babylonian creation-legends and deluge-myths. He uses it as a touchstone to try the validity of the theories which would make Israelite culture closely dependent on Babylonia. If the Hebrew law is derived from Hammurabi's Code, then that dependence was very powerful. But if no direct connexion can be shown, then 'only the strongest arguments will allow us to accept those views in accordance with which Palestine had been saturated with Babylonian culture and civilization centuries before Hebrew history took its rise.'

Mr. Cook means to be strictly fair to the con-

¹ *The Laws of Moses and the Code of Hammurabi.* By S. A. Cook, M.A., Fellow of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge, Member of the Editorial Staff of the *Encyclopædia Biblica*. London: A. & C. Black, 1903. Price 6s.

tentions of Babylonian influence which he rejects, but he occasionally misses the force of them. When he finds a similarity, he regards it as due to common Semitic ideas ; or, finding a parallel outside Semitic law, thinks the custom too common to show borrowing. But one may carry these arguments too far. There is very little that they could not be made to explain. It is, on the whole, well to demand very strict proof for the theories he opposes. There has been too much tendency of late to accept unproved suggestions. A wholesome reaction will do no harm.

An example may make his point clear. He admits a fairly strong likeness in phraseology between the treatment of the Hebrew slave (Ex 21^{2ff.}) and the freeborn Babylonian enslaved for debt (sec. 117). Against this he contends that the Hebrew phraseology shows no signs of taking over technical phrases from the Code. In other words, as in the case of the deluge-story, the wording is native. But was this Israelite or Canaanite? He does not note that the six years according to Deuteronomy was a double term of service. The custom then seems to have been to go out in the fourth year as in Babylonia, the law doubled the term. Here, as in several other cases, the Hebrew law seems to come in to settle between a primitive Semitic (Israelite) custom and that already obtaining in the land, which looks very like a local reminiscence of the Code.

The Code itself exhibits the same phenomenon. It was clearly a harmonizing attempt to reconcile two distinct laws, that of the native long civilized Babylonian and the new conquering race, probably a fresh infusion of primitive Semitic blood. Whether this race was akin to the Israelites or not, does not affect the point. Both peoples were Semitic. The Babylonian was using the ancient language, Sumerian, up to the ascendancy of the First Dynasty. The new folks imposed some of their primitive laws on the land, but on the whole they were more modified by the higher civilization. In Palestine, the Semitic invaders, Israelites, imposed more of their views. The common primitive customs are due to this Semitic ascendancy, in varied intensity in the two lands. The earlier, higher civilization, shows more in the Code. Its traces in the Hebrew law are less marked, they need more reconstruction from fragmentary remains. They were due to Babylonian influence, perhaps, not to the prevalence of the Code, but of that

civilization which it embodied and adapted from the earlier inhabitants.

On the whole, Mr. Cook reduces the traces of Babylonian influence to a minimum. The student does well to start at that level. If strong argument forces him to admit somewhat more, he should apply the same rigorous methods as Mr. Cook does. The controversy is sure to be a long one, and every fresh Babylonian monument found in Palestine will revive it. This work will remain the strongest statement of the case against Babylonian influence that we are likely to have. It is all the more valuable for that.

C. H. W. JOHNS.

Queens' College, Cambridge.

THE EXPOSITOR'S GREEK TESTAMENT. VOL. III.

Hodder & Stoughton. 28s.

The third volume contains 2 Corinthians, by Dean Bernard of Dublin; Galatians, by Mr. Rendall; Ephesians, by Principal Salmond; Philippians, by Dr. Kennedy; and Colossians, by Professor Peake. Will another volume complete the New Testament? It will have to be a thick one.

The new name among commentators is Dr. H. A. A. Kennedy's. We must look at his work. But before that, What does Dean Bernard say about the two-epistle theory of Second Corinthians? In the new 'Cambridge Bible' volume this month, Dr. Plummer argues for it. Is it to be an accepted result? It would be a triumph of criticism if it were, for there is absolutely no external evidence for it. But Dean Bernard says no. He still believes that the 'Painful Letter' alluded to in 2 Co 2⁴ 7^{8,12} is 1 Corinthians, and that 2 Corinthians is a unity. Perhaps his most effective argument is, that whereas half the critics who find two letters in 2 Co (Kennedy, Clemen, Schmiedel) make x.-xiii. an earlier letter than i.-ix., the other half (Semler, Drescher, Krenkel) make it later.

But about Dr. Kennedy. First of all, the literature, especially the German literature, is all here and mastered. The fulness of the literature makes the commentary double its own value; for besides the balance of authority which it affords us, at every turn there is a reference to some book or magazine which we shall find worth following up; and then the mastery of the literature leaves the author free to express his own mind. And Dr. Kennedy has a mind, though it is an open one.

That is the next thing, the daring openness of Dr. Kennedy's mind. Kabish thinks that to St. Paul 'life' had no ethical value, but was merely extension of existence. Dr. Kennedy says, Davidson-like, that there may be more in that than we, with our modern ideas, allow. This is the direction in which Dr. Kennedy's mind lies most open. He knows that we have not the apostle's atmosphere around us; if we had, we should understand more and comment less. The term 'Lord,' he says, has become one of the most lifeless words in the Christian vocabulary. To enter into its meaning, and give it practical effect, would be to re-create in great measure the atmosphere of the Apostolic Age.

Principal Salmond, whose *St. Peter* in the 'Popular Commentary' should have drawn much more expository work out of him, had a great opportunity with Ephesians, and he has taken it. He has also taken most space to it, which the others will not grudge, for none of it is lost.

But the book is too big for review in one issue. We must come back to it again and again, for of course it will always be at our hand. One thing may safely be said of it in conclusion, that this volume is abreast of the latest scholarship, and in touch with the most loyal Christian thought.

SYNOPSIS OF THE GOSPELS IN GREEK.

Macmillan. 10s. net.

Dr. Arthur Wright's Synopsis has been the steady standby of all earnest students of the Gospels since the issue of the first edition in 1896. If there are students of the Gospels who have been working without it, they must not mention the fact, they would almost as soon be credited as students if they confessed that they did not possess Geden's *Concordance*. But indispensable—and indispensable without any exaggeration—as Dr. Wright's first edition has been, his second edition wholly supersedes the first. It is more than twice the size. It is another book. The first edition was one of the student's necessary tools; the second edition is a tool of the newest, finest workmanship, a joy to work with.

But it is more than that. The ordinary teacher and preacher will find its value now. For besides the Synopsis, there are many notes, great and small, and every note is a courageous scholar's most careful work. Thus on page 25, that worrying

little discrepancy in Mk 2²⁸, 'when Abiathar was high priest,' is discussed. Ahimelech, we are told in the Old Testament, and not Abiathar, was high priest when David ate the shewbread. Dr. Wright counts it probable that there is a clerical error in the Hebrew MSS of 2 S 8¹⁷, and that this error misled the writer of Chronicles and St. Mark. Critically speaking, he says, the words in St. Mark are an editorial addition to the trito-Mark, and if there is a mistake it is entirely due to St. Mark's desire to supplement the narrative with his own explanations.

Pass over a page or two. On page 31 we have an arresting note on Judas Iscariot. He stands last in the list of the apostles, but Dr. Wright finds evidence for believing that originally he was first. He was entrusted with the bag. The order of the Last Supper in E. G. Lewis's picture places him next our Lord, St. John being on the other side, and St. Peter far off. That order suits the beckonings and whispers of the Fourth Gospel best. Above all, St. Mark distinctly calls him chief of the Twelve (taking the Biblical Greek, $\delta \epsilon \iota \varsigma = \delta \pi \rho \omega \tau \circ \varsigma$). The first became last and the last first.

Enough. No, the Indexes must be mentioned. They are of English expressions, of Greek words, and of texts. They are thorough and rich, like the work in the book throughout.

When you have hit upon some original interpretation of the Gospels, turn up and see if Wright has not got it before you.

THE PSALMS IN HUMAN LIFE.

Murray. 10s. 6d. net.

Mr. Rowland Prothero is already known as the author of the 'Life of Dean Stanley.' That is not the masterpiece which Dean Stanley's 'Life of Thomas Arnold' is. But now he has written a book which will stand first in its subject, though many have written on its subject before him. The subject is the Psalms in History, what they have been to men in the toil and battle of life. It is the occupation of a lifetime. It involves reading enormously, and always with an eye to this one thing.

There must have been moments when Mr. Prothero wondered, not if it was worth it, but if he would ever say to himself, Hold, enough! and then begin to put it all into shape. But now the greatest wonder is that he has overcome the disconnections

of his material and written an eloquent book. It is almost too eloquent. There is no rest for the sole of the foot from the rush of its eloquence. But of course one is not compelled to read it right through. The value of such a book is discovered when we are preparing our sermons and addresses. And Mr. Prothero has been alive to that. The indexes are exhaustive and excellent.

In the book no portion is fuller or fairer than that which deals with the Covenanters of Scotland. It is said that a certain Scotch judge was much impressed by the lines—

Scotland shall live while Scotland learns
The psalms of David and the songs of Burns.

We do not know what the Covenanters would have said to the songs of Burns, but they were great on the Psalms of David.

SIR GEORGE GROVE.

Macmillan. 12s. 6d. net.

We had kept the life of Sir George Grove, which is written by Mr. C. L. Graves, for a separate and substantial article. For there is material in it and to spare. Perhaps that may come yet. It is the kind of book which lives; age cannot wither nor custom stale its infinite variety. But books push one another aside so rapidly now. It must have notice, however inadequately.

Who was Sir George Grove? That is to rewrite his biography. He was so many things. Most of us have known him in two capacities, as the editor of a *Dictionary of Music* and as the writer of geographical articles in Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*. But these were both accidents almost in his career. He was chiefly a traveller and delightful raconteur. He knew most people and most places worth knowing, and how he could speak of them! His connexion with Smith's *Dictionary* was due to his versatility. He knew nothing about the Bible—except that he knew all about everything. But he heard from Dean Stanley or somebody that a list of the proper names in the Bible was wanted. Why should it be wanted any longer? He prepared it. Stanley told Smith about it. Smith engaged him to write on the *Dictionary*. He went twice to Palestine to equip himself, and wrote 1100 pages of the 3154 contained in the *Dictionary*. He wrote that number of pages and signed them; but he wrote a great deal more than that, as additions to other men's articles. In one case he wrote a

whole article which was signed by another man, in order that the other man should have the pay for it. We cannot get up dictionaries in that way now.

But about Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*—to end this inadequate notice with an anecdote—we are told in the biography that when it appeared, the *Record* said: 'The ostensible editor seems to have done no editing at all.' Whereupon Dr. Smith replied to the effect that the whole undertaking entirely originated with him; that he selected the contributors, apportioned the work, suggested where necessary the mode of treatment, omitted some articles, altered others, and revised the whole; and appealed to his contributors to verify his statements. 'No attempt,' says Mr. Graves, 'was made to impugn the accuracy of this crushing rejoinder, for the sufficing reason that it was strictly and entirely in accordance with the facts of the case.'

DR. GUINNESS ROGERS' AUTOBIOGRAPHY.

James Clarke & Co. 7s. 6d.

This is a political autobiography. And for once the adjective has no disparagement. This is a political autobiography for the political *opponents* of Dr. Guinness Rogers to read, 'What is a political dissenter?' Here he is, unblushing and delightful. 'If only they were all like this!' Perhaps they are. What one may be, why may not all the rest? There is another side, you see, an honest, faithful, loving side. 'Yes, yes, we may meet up yonder after all.' Up yonder? why not here? Dr. Guinness Rogers is with us still. He is ready to meet with any of us. On the whole, if we do not meet here we may not find much gain in meeting 'up yonder.'

Which is best, the politics or the religion? They cannot be thought of apart. For the kingdom of Christ is to be prayed for in this way, 'Thy will be done on earth,' and Dr. Rogers could not forget that. He can hate of course, but only measures, never men. He can love both men and measures. His most cutting word is of Mr. Chamberlain, and it is this, 'I regarded his separation from the Liberal party at the time with deep regret, *which, however, is not so strong to-day as it was then*'—and the italics are not Dr. Rogers'.

It is pleasing to learn that His Majesty the

King has accepted a copy of the autobiography. Unless they speak him ill he will find much pleasure in it.

EXILES OF ETERNITY.

Hodder & Stoughton, 7s. 6d. net.

The Rev. John S. Carroll has dared to publish an exposition of Dante's *Inferno*. He is not alone in his daring, it is true. Many have dared before him. But that makes his venture all the more venturesome. For he knows very well that of the many who have ventured few have been successful. It is the surprise of finding Dante so easy that flatters men into publishing. But Dante is too difficult for those who find him easy.

This is to be said, then, for Mr. Carroll. He has not found Dante easy. He has gone beyond that discovery. He has studied Dante enough to discover that he will never be able to understand him. Partly he thinks he understands him, otherwise he would not publish. But largely he knows that Dante is and will ever be beyond him. When the day comes that Dante is studied at school as much as Virgil is studied to-day; when we get over the difficulties of grammar and the most assured historical allusions there, then we may make some general advance in our knowledge of Dante. But as a mere parergon Dante is too much.

So what Mr. Carroll has done is this. He has told us (in language simple and appropriate enough to be a surprise, and a most pleasant surprise) what a man has found in Dante whose chief interest is ethical, but who does not lay claim to special historical or philological knowledge. He has set himself to answer this question, What can Dante do for us in the conflict with the world, the flesh, and the devil? And it is safe to say that in answering that question broadly and intelligently he has done more for us than if he had proved himself a master of Dante minutiae.

The publishers have recognized the worth of the book in the handsome way in which they have published it.

Other Books of the Month.

Professor Witton Davies of Bangor has made a contribution to the study of Hebrew and Christian

music in the form of a pamphlet, published by Messrs. Alexander & Shephard (3d.) We wish there had been more of it; but it will not be forgotten.

THE TEN VIRGINS.

There is not much in these sermons (S. C. Brown; 3s. 6d.). It is not much, alas, that one can ever give in a sermon. The education of our people in righteousness is all so scrappy and haphazard that one has for ever to be giving them the food of babes. But what there is, is real. The Rector of Upper Chelsea has too many real problems to face in his daily ministry to be unreal in the pulpit. It is the very elements of the gospel and of right living, but it is the gospel, it is right living. And Mr. Gamble's strong sympathetic face, as the portrait in the book reveals it, will make the real words he speaks abide and bear fruit.

Messrs. S. C. Brown have entered the Haeckel and anti-Haeckel fray with ten threepenny pamphlets. The general title is 'Faith and Freedom Press Pamphlets.' They are pitched a trifle high, but they do not lack 'go,' and the Committee which selects them will find its mark yet.

The 'Cambridge Bible for Colleges and Schools' is ended. The 'Cambridge Bible for Colleges and Schools' has begun. The author of the *Commentary on 2 Corinthians* was Chancellor Lias. He wrote his English edition twenty-four years ago. Instead of a new edition we have a new commentary by Dr. Alfred Plummer, both English (1s. 6d. net) and Greek (3s.). If one wished to see at a glance the progress of a quarter of a century of New Testament study, let him compare Plummer with Lias. To take one momentous matter, Lias never heard of 2 Corinthians being made up of two distinct letters, or fragments of letters; Plummer does not count it proved, but 'advocates it rather strongly.' Nor is the vast increase in riches which the Notes show, due to the difference of authorship only, Lias never heard of Deissmann.

The Cambridge Press has also issued a short commentary for schools on the R.V. of *St. Mark* (1s. 6d. net). It is edited by Sir A. F. Hort, Bart., and his sister, Mrs. Chitty.

Messrs. Dent have started 'The Temple Series

of Handbooks' under the charge of that industrious and accomplished editor of books, Mr Oliphant Smeaton. The volumes are very small quarto, selling, we think, at a shilling. They are meant for the very busy man who wants to know something about the Bible and religion as he runs. Four volumes are now published—*A Primer of Old Testament History*, by the Rev. O. R. Barnicott, D.D.; *The Religions of India*, by Professor Allan Menzies; *Abraham*, by Professor Duff; and *David*, by Canon Knox Little. They are fully furnished with frontispiece (admirably executed) and bibliography.

So great around us is the ignorance of the Bible and the God of the Bible that it is said Haeckel has made many proselytes in our land. An antidote to Haeckel is needed, and it is at hand. Professor Loofs has written it; Dr. H. R. Mackintosh has translated it; Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton have published it. Its title is *Anti-Haeckel* (6d.). Get it and circulate it. There is no evil in it of any kind, no evil speaking or evil thinking even of Haeckel, there is immeasurable good.

ANDREW HALLIDAY DOUGLAS.

A memoir by his brother, Charles Douglas, M.P., a note by the Rev. R. S. Simpson of the High Church, Edinburgh, and five sermons—that is the record of Halliday Douglas and of the work he did (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s.). The whole may be read within an hour. And it is sure enough to be read at least by those who had heard of the man. For others there is nothing startling to arrest the attention either in the memoir or in the sermons. An earnest, strenuous soul, facing the problems which every thinking man has to face on the threshold of manhood, and making some compromises with the intellect, none with the moral life—that is the memoir.

And the sermons agree with the memoir. They are uncommon sermons. But their uniqueness lies in the frank avowal that the intellect *has* to accept compromise while the moral life is braced by that very necessity. It was for such a man a resolve, almost heroic, to go back to his pulpit in Cambridge after he had been called away to a chair in Toronto, and preach in the morning on 'The Spring in the Soul,' and in the evening on 'The Religion of Joy.'

THE MASTER'S QUESTIONS TO THE DISCIPLES.

The Rev. G. H. Knight has published, through Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton (5s.), a beautiful and precious volume of sermons, the selected fruit no doubt of a long and fruitful ministry. The choice is made of such sermons as dealt with some questions put by our Lord, so that there is no scheme of theology or system of ethics in the book. There is variety and fifty-two real sermons. The first is on, 'Are ye not much better than they?' which forbids, not foresight, but foreboding, and Mr. Knight makes it tell effectively on the worries of our life, ending in this way, 'Would that I had more of Martin Luther's simple faith, who, in a time of much distress, looking out of his window, and seeing a blackbird sitting on a bough and singing its very best in the midst of pelting rain, said, "Why cannot I too sit still and sing, and let God think for me?"'

BENJAMIN GREGORY.

Here is an autobiography worthy to be named along with Morley's *Gladstone*. For it is the essential, not the accidental, that makes a man or a biography. And essentially Dr. Gregory and Mr. Gladstone were at one. Both were moved, swayed, absorbed by their religion. Did their conception of religion differ? Again only in its accidents. Mr. Gladstone was an unbending High Churchman, Dr. Gregory was an unswerving evangelical. But what then? Their religion made them both, and made them both like Christ.

The atmosphere is Wesleyan, of course. It is intensely, boastfully Wesleyan. And being so, it is of course literary. The Wesleys are all literary. Their love of books approaches as near idolatry as a Wesleyan dare. Dr. Gregory loved books as books, and he read them too, and could criticize them. A new book was an intense delight, especially when books were hard to find. If one would know what were the books that moved men most in the middle of the last century, one should read Dr. Gregory's Autobiography (Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d.).

The volume of *The Preacher's Magazine* for 1903 (Kelly; 5s.) is now ready for those who take it out in volumes. It is the fourteenth yearly volume, under the editorship still of Dr. A. E. Gregory, who gave it its being at the first. For

the Wesleyans, with all their 'itinerancy,' know how to keep the right man in the right place when once they have him there.

EMBER THOUGHTS.

In this small volume of Ember Addresses given at Ely, Dr. B. W. Randolph is very intimate with his hearers. He searches their motives with a great scrutiny of love for them and responsibility to Christ. He insists that the outward call gives mere officialism; its worth lies in the response of the free will in the man (Longmans; 2s. net).

Messrs. Macniven & Wallace have published *The Scottish Church and University Almanac* for 1904 (1s. net). Whether it is that the Churches and the Universities are growing, or that the editor is gathering more information into his book, certain it is that the book is increasing in bulk. It has become an indispensable handbook.

The Rev. H. E. Stone, who publishes a study of the Book of Job, entitled *From Behind the Veil* (Marlborough; 2s. 6d. net), is not troubled with criticism, nor does he trouble us. He does not thereby bring more out of Job than Professor Davidson did, but he has his own thoughts for his own audience. He is very evangelical.

IS NOT THIS THE CHRIST?

'Musafir,' the author of this book (Marshall Brothers; 6s.), believes that we greatly misunderstand much of the Bible by forgetting that it is an Eastern book. We misunderstand Eastern ways of thinking, and especially Eastern religious ritual customs. So he endeavours to enlighten us. For example: Martha said, 'Lord, by this time he stinketh, for he hath been dead four days.' The emphasis is on the number four. For three days it was held quite possible to raise the dead, for 'all Orientals believe that after death the spirit hovers near its mortal envelope, the body, for three days.' But if seventy-two hours have elapsed, the spirit has departed and decomposition has set in. Thus it is far easier for an Oriental than for us to believe that Christ rose from the dead on the third day. Throughout the book there are many new things, some happy and some unhappy, but all making for thought, and driving home the saying that there are yet many things to be discovered in the Word of God.

THE BEAUTY OF THE SAVIOUR.

The Rev. F. S. Webster, Rector of All Souls, Portland Place, has published a volume of sermons, which has the merit of system as well as variety. The Beauty of the Saviour is first seen in the Old Testament, next manifested in the Gospels, then defined in the Creed, and finally reflected in the Christian's conduct. Five or six sermons are occupied with each division. There is intense earnestness of purpose and a very close clinging to the written Word throughout (Marshall Brothers; 3s. 6d.).

Messrs Marshall Brothers have also published *Branches of the Vine*, a story for girls, by Frances Stratton (3s. 6d.); *Pearls from the Psalter*, by F. M. Wade; *The Spirit of Life*, in the 'Quiet Hour' Series, by the Rev. J. Stuart Holden, M.A. (1s. net); and four volumes of a new series to be called 'The Gathered Spoil' Series, of which we must speak more fully after—*Remarkable Letters of St. Paul*, by Professor Webb-Peploe; *The Brightening East*, by Dr. J. H. Townsend; *The Word of God and the Testimony of Jesus Christ*, by Dr. C. H. Waller; *The Holy Scriptures and the Higher Criticism*, by the Rev. John R. Palmer.

After Confirmation—What and How? So the Rev. R. C. Joynt, M.A., puts it (Nisbet; 1s.). And it is a more important question than, What is Confirmation? Mr. Joynt's answer is very full and searching. If it could but be taken seriously and acted on!

OUR POSSESSIONS.

Mr. Francis Bourdillon here gives an inventory of the believer's inheritance in Christ. The first item is Christ Himself, for in Him are hid all the treasures. And in Him they are all found; not once does Mr. Bourdillon discover any possession that is not in Him. He was enriched himself, he says, by thinking on the riches that are to be found in Christ. Surely we shall be enriched by reading of them (Nisbet; 2s. net).

Messrs. Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier have issued a small volume, beautifully printed and strongly bound, on the *Sacraments of the New Testament*. It is written by the Rev. David Purves, M.A., of Belfast. For the Bible Class or in preparing for Confirmation it will be found as accessible and as

workable as any of the numerous handbooks now happily in existence.

The forty-ninth yearly volume of C. H. Spurgeon's Sermons has been published (*Metropolitan Tabernacle Pulpit*, 1903; Passmore & Alabaster; 7s.). To recognize the fact that the Jubilee volume has commenced, the publishers have printed the first number with gold ink. It is not so easy to read, but it is worth the honour and the trouble. Is it not altogether a phenomenon the issue of Spurgeon's Sermons year by year, month by month, week by week, for fifty years on end? Does any other department of literary activity show the like? What is the secret? Not Spurgeon. The secret is Christ. Spurgeon preached Christ with simplicity and directness. That is the secret of the popularity of his sermons.

In the 'Anti-Papal Library' of the R.T.S. appears a new edition of Dr. Stoughton's *Homes and Haunts of Luther*, edited by Mr. C. H. Irwin (2s. 6d.).

THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH.

Dr. R. F. Weidner of the Chicago Lutheran Seminary has a good gift. And he understands thoroughly what his gift is. It is the gift of précis-writing. He can condense. He can condense great books like Luthardt into a small book like this (Revell), and the small book is more attractive and more useful than the great. His subject here is the Church. He ends his exposition with very good questions and a very good index.

THE RICHES OF CHRIST.

It is an objection to preaching from notes that when the sermon is over it is not ready for publishing. But the Rev. Frederic B. Macnutt, M.A., who preached from notes at Christ Church, Wimbledon, to 'a cultured and thoughtful congregation,' overcame that objection by writing out his sermons for the press afterwards (Rivington; 6s.). It is not the sermons he preached. There is the value of them. To preach is one thing, to publish is another. And the very reason why we have some poor preachers and so many poor volumes of sermons, is that some preachers preach what they have written as for the press, while many publish what they have preached in the pulpit. Mr. Macnutt's sermons are fuller of matter, and it is in a

far more readable form, than if he had written his sermons before he preached them. His volume is literature, in short; and it will now make its own impression on the large congregation that will read, just as his sermon made its own impression on the smaller congregation that listened.

Of all the thin-paper leather-bound pocket editions of the great English writers, we have seen nothing more attractive than *Mrs. Browning's Poetical Works* as issued by her own publishers, Messrs. Smith, Elder, & Co. The type is a good size and well spaced. The paper is white and restful, quite opaque also though so thin. And the leather binding is a charming new maroon. The three volumes (3s. net each) make up as satisfactory a gift as will be found in a whole afternoon's search.

Mr. Stockwell has published this month (1) a course of Character Studies from the Old Testament, by the Rev. J. G. Greenhough, under the title of *Half-Hours in God's Older Picture Gallery*, (3s. net); (2) a smaller volume of sermons, by Dr. Alfred Rowland, called *Open Windows* (2s. 6d. net); (3) a pamphlet on *Family Worship*, by F. G. Kemp (6d. net).

The Church of England S.S. Institute has sent out the yearly volume (2s.) of *The Boys' and Girls' Companion*, and *A Year's Teaching for Infant Classes*, second series, by Phillis Dent (2s.).

The Sunday School Union has published (1) *Motto Cards for the Year*; (2) *Pocket Notes on the International Lessons* (1s. net), by Frank Spooner, B. A.; (3) *The Sunday School Teacher's Pocket Book*—original and indispensable (2s.); (4) *Notes on the Lessons for 1904* (2s. 6d. net); and (5) *The Hundredth Year*, a handsome volume, giving the story of the centenary celebrations, edited by M. Jennie Street.

Mr. Thynne has published a revised edition (the third) of Canon Fausset's apology for the Prayer Book. He calls it *A Guide to the Study of the Book of Common Prayer* (1s. net), but it is an apology, and it is written in the language of apology. Thus chap. ii. opens: 'The subject for our consideration is the Book of Common Prayer, and its compilers—no common book and no common men. Never was there a day,' etc.

The book is thus admirably fitted for the multitude. It is strongly anti-sacerdotal.

FAMOUS MEN OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

Quite elementary is the theology, history, and morality of Dr. Morton Bryan Wharton's volume of sermons and Old Testament characters. Still the sermons were listened to with interest. And why? Because Dr. Wharton took an interest in them himself. We are always entitled to ask, 'What is Absalom to me, or me to Absalom?' Dr. Wharton answers us. 'If there were no Absaloms to-day, if there were not an Absalom in each of us, we would leave Absalom to the literary critics. 'Is the young man Absalom safe?' That, says he, is the great question of the times now, more important than those which concern commerce, manufacturing, and trade, imperialism, finance, or the solution of race problems. With such insistence Dr. Wharton's elementary theology and history become arrestive enough (New York: E. B. Treat; \$1.50).

The annual volume of that charming children's magazine, *Morning Rays* (1s. net), is charming also in its binding (Pub. Offices of the Church of Scotland).

TRUST.

The name is short. The greatest things on earth have short names. 'Now abideth these three, Faith, Hope, Love'—one syllable each. And this is, within its strictly defined sphere, a

great magazine. Strictly defined, but not narrow. The strength of it lies for once in its breadth. There are intensely earnest and intensely narrow evangelical magazines, and their earnestness seems to depend on their narrowness. This magazine is as earnest in its appeal as any, but its appeal is to 'all ye that labour and are heavy laden.' The yearly volume, a handsome quarto, may be had from the Religious Tract and Book Society of Edinburgh for 2s., post free.

MEDIÆVAL ENGLAND.

The 'Story of the Nations' still goes on. Miss Mary Bateson's story of *Mediæval England* (Fisher Unwin; 5s.) is the sixty-second volume. For almost all the volumes possess the double quality of popularity and precision. The writing is for the multitude, and the lavish selection of illustrations helps the multitude to enjoy it. But the work is scholar's work all the same—laborious research, responsible statement.

Miss Bateson, Associate and Lecturer of Newnham College, Cambridge, has one of the gifts in perfection. Her work is thorough, and she has risen clean above the manner of the mere popularity hunter. It is doubtful if the book could be called popular in any sense, it is too passionless for that. But its style is good, its temper fair, it will win its way. And although both the papal and the anti-papal denunciator will rail at Miss Bateson's Laodiceanism, the truth-seeker everywhere will rejoice that her knowledge has made her so fair.

INDEX OF SUBJECTS IN RECENT THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE.

BOOKS.

BOOKS INDEXED.

BETHUNE-BAKER (J. F.), Early History of Christian Doctrine.
 COOKE (G. A.), Text-Book of N. Semitic Inscriptions.
 DODS (M.), Forerunners of Dante.
 GAYFORD (S. C.), The Future State.
 GOLD (W. J.), Sacrificial Worship.
 GOUDGE (H. L.), First Epistle to the Corinthians.
 GREEN (S. G.), Handbook of Church History.
 HENSON (H. H.), English Religion in the 17th Century.
 HEUVER (G. D.), The Teaching of Jesus concerning Wealth.
 HUTTON (J. A.), Browning on Matters of Faith.
 JONES (G. H.), Dawn of European Civilisation.

JOSEPH (M.), Judaism as Creed and Life.
 LILLY (W. S.), Christianity and Modern Civilization.
 MACDONALD (G.), The Religious Sense in its Scientific Aspect.
 MARVIN (W. T.), Introduction to Systematic Philosophy.
 MATHESON (G.), Representative Men of the Bible. Vol. II.
 MEANS (S.), Saint Paul and the Ante-Nicene Church.
 MOORE (G. E.), Principia Ethica.
 ROBERTSON (J. M.), Pagan Christs.
 ROBINSON (J. A.), St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians.
 ROTHERHAM (J. B.), Our Sacred Books.
 SANDAY (W.), Sacred Sites of the Gospels.
Scottish Church Society Conferences. '3rd Series.
 SHALER (N. S.), The Individual.
 SOUTTAR (R.), Short History of Ancient Peoples.

STRONG (T. B.), Authority in the Church.
 TENNANT (F. R.), The Fall and Original Sin.
 WEBSTER (W.), Gleanings in Church History.
 WERNLE (P.), The Beginnings of Christianity. Vol. I.
 WESTCOTT (B. F.), Christian Society Union Addresses.
 WRIGHT (T. H.), The Finger of God.

SUBJECTS.

Aaron, MATHESON 85-105.
 Abara, SANDAY 23.
 Ænon, SANDAY 33 ff., 91.
 Æsthetics, MARVIN 511-520.
 Aged, Treatment in Early Europe, JONES 168-183.
 Agriculture in Early Europe, JONES 113-124.
 Alexandrines, MEANS 203-280.
 Alzon (Père d'), WEBSTER 239-252.
 America, Religions, ROBERTSON 361-422.
 Antonia (Castle of), SANDAY 52 ff., 106 ff.
 Apocalypse, WERNLE 360-390.
 Apollinarianism, BETHUNE-BAKER 239-254.
 Apostolic Fathers, MEANS 64-122.
 Aramaic Inscriptions, COOKE 159-213.
 Architecture in Palestine, SANDAY 14 ff., 58 ff., 113.
 Arian Controversy, BETHUNE-BAKER 155-196.
 Art and Science in Early Europe, JONES, 427-450.
 Atomic Theory, MARVIN 64 ff.
 Atonement, Day, JOSEPH 258-277.
 „ Doctrine of Early Church, BETHUNE-BAKER
 327-355.
 Authority, STRONG 1-17.
 „ Church, STRONG 1.
 „ and the Creed, STRONG 97-132.
 „ „ Custom, STRONG 133-173.
 „ „ Reason, STRONG 18-36.
 „ „ Outward Order, STRONG 78-96.
 Babylonia, SOUTTAR 75-144.
 Balaam, MATHESON 62-84.
 Baptism, Early Church Doctrine, BETHUNE-BAKER 376-392.
 Beautiful Gate, SANDAY 65 ff., 110.
 Beersheba, SANDAY 40.
 Beloved (The), as Messianic Title, ROBINSON 229-233.
 Benevolence, JOSEPH 458 ff.
 Bethabara, SANDAY 23, 35.
 Bethany, SANDAY 20, 24, 49.
 „ beyond Jordan, SANDAY 11, 23, 35, 94.
 Bethesda Pool, SANDAY 55-58, 93 f.
 Bethlehem of Judah, SANDAY 3, 19, 24 f., 49.
 „ „ Galilee, SANDAY 24 f.
 Bethsaida, SANDAY 41 f., 45, 48, 91, 95.
 Bible in Judaism, JOSEPH 14-28.
 Boaz, MATHESON 128-149.
 Brethren of the Lord, GOUDGE 80 f.
 Business, Integrity in, JOSEPH 424-432.
 Cæsarea, SANDAY 14, 16.
 „ Philippi, SANDAY 14.
 Caleb, MATHESON 106-127.
 Calendar, Jewish, JOSEPH 310-320.
 Cana, SANDAY 24.
 Capernaum, SANDAY 36-48.
 Caiaphas, House, SANDAY 54, 80, 87.

Carthage, SOUTTAR 307-340.
 „ Punic Inscriptions, COOKE 123 ff.
 Casuistry, HENSON 171, 210.
 Chiasm, BETHUNE-BAKER 68 ff.
 Chorazin, SANDAY 24, 29, 48.
 Christ, Call, WERNLE 37-55.
 „ Claim, WERNLE 73-95.
 „ Conservatism, HEUVER 189-202.
 „ Economic Teaching, HEUVER 125-138.
 „ Miracles, WRIGHT 1.
 „ Promise, WERNLE 56-72.
 „ Purpose, HEUVER 109-125.
 „ Redeemer, WERNLE 96-116.
 „ Teaching on His Miracles, WRIGHT 20-37.
 „ „ „ Property, HEUVER 139-154.
 „ „ „ Use of Riches, HEUVER 171-188.
 „ „ „ Worship of Wealth, HEUVER 155-170.
 Christianity, Early Influence, LILLY 101-161.
 Christians, Early, WERNLE 117-137.
 Christian Latin Poets, WEBSTER 37-60.
 „ Epitaphs in Spain, WEBSTER 61-78.
 Church, Catholic, MEANS 123-202.
 Church Chronological Tables, GREEN 579-611.
 „ and Churches, GOUDGE 115 f.
 „ Early, LILLY 47-87.
 „ „ Doctrine, BETHUNE-BAKER 356-375.
 „ of England, Pre-Laudian, HENSON 1-34.
 „ in Epistles, STRONG 37-56.
 „ „ Gospels and Acts, STRONG 37-56.
 „ History, GREEN 1.
 „ Temple of God, GOUDGE 29.
 Civilization, Dawn of, in Europe, JONES 1.
 Class Distinctions, Origin, JONES 260-276.
 Clement, MEANS 203-280.
 Coins, Aramaic, COOKE 343 ff.
 „ Jewish, COOKE 352 ff.
 „ Phœnician, COOKE 347 ff.
 Colomba (Philomena de S.), WEBSTER 177-198.
 Commerce in Early Europe, JONES 406-426.
 Congresses, Eucharistic, WEBSTER 276-310.
 Conversion in Browning, HUTTON 45-82.
 Corinthians (First Epistle), GOUDGE 1.
 Cosmogony, MARVIN 291-336.
 Cosmology, MARVIN 217-290.
 Council (Latin-American) at Rome, WEBSTER 311-337.
 Cyprus, Inscriptions, COOKE 52-89.
 Dalmanutha, SANDAY 22.
 Daniel, MATHESON 331-351.
 Days, Holy, in Judaism, JOSEPH 196-201.
 Dead, Visits and Visions, DODS 1.
 Death, Individual and, SHALER 203-237.
 „ Society and, SHALER 238-250.
 Decapolis, SANDAY 36.
 Descent to Hades, DODS, 83-100.
 Dietary Laws in Judaism, JOSEPH 180-195.
 Divorce, GOUDGE 65 ff.
 Doctrine, Development, BETHUNE-BAKER 33-40.
 „ in N.T., BETHUNE-BAKER 9-32.
 „ Sources, BETHUNE-BAKER 41-61.
 Duties to Religious Community, JOSEPH 498-509.
 „ „ Others, JOSEPH 394-482.

- Duties, to Self, JOSEPH 364-393.
 „ „ State, JOSEPH 483-498.
 Ebal, Mt., SANDAY 31, 91.
 Ebionism, BETHUNE-BAKER 63-71.
 Edessa, SANDAY 21.
 Education, Aim and Method, WESTCOTT 30-39.
 Egypt, SOUTTAR 3-74.
 Emmaus, SANDAY 29 ff., 49, 92.
 Ephesians (Ep.), ROBINSON.
 Epistolary Phrases, ROBINSON 275-284.
 Epitaphs, Early Church in Spain, WEBSTER 61-78.
 Erastianism, HENSON 125-170.
 Ethics and Conduct, MOORE 142-182.
 „ Metaphysical, MOORE 110-141.
 „ Naturalistic, MOORE 37-58.
 „ Subject-Matter, MOORE 1-36.
 „ Theoretical, MARVIN 489-510.
 Eucharist, Congresses, WEBSTER 276-310.
 „ Early Church Doctrine, BETHUNE-BAKER, 393-429.
 Eutychianism, BETHUNE-BAKER 281-300.
 Evil, Mystery in Browning, HUTTON 83-116.
 Expenditure, WESTCOTT 55-61.
 Ezekiel, MATHESON 309-330.
 Faith, Browning's, HUTTON 9-44.
 „ and Reason, JOSEPH 39-50.
 Fall, Doctrine in Fathers, TENNANT 273-346.
 „ „ „ Judaism, TENNANT 122-247.
 „ „ „ Old Testament, TENNANT 89-105.
 „ „ „ St. Paul, TENNANT 248-272.
 „ „ „ Sirach, TENNANT 106-121.
 „ „ „ Story, Ethnological Origin, TENNANT 22-60.
 „ „ „ Exegesis, TENNANT 1-21.
 „ „ „ Psychological Origin, TENNANT 61-88.
 Family in Early Europe, JONES 125-138, 199-215, 277-300.
 „ Jewish, JOSEPH 405-423.
 Fear, SHALER 188-202.
 Festivals and Fasts of Judaism, JOSEPH 278-289.
 Folklore in Nineteenth Century, WEBSTER 338-352.
 Fourth Gospel, Date, SANDAY 95 f.
 Freedom of Religion, MACDONALD 161-243.
 „ „ Will, JOSEPH 99-111.
 Future Life in Church Teaching, JONES 24-122.
 „ „ „ Early Europe, JONES 494-512.
 „ „ „ N.T. Times, GAYFORD 18-23.
 „ „ „ Q.T., GAYFORD 1-17.
 „ „ „ Visions of, DODS 1.
 Gabara, SANDAY 28.
 Gadara, SANDAY, 26-29, 93.
 Galilee, Inhabitants, SANDAY 13, 36.
 „ Villages, SANDAY 16.
 Garden Tomb, SANDAY 67-71, 88.
 Gerasa of Decapolis, SANDAY 19, 27.
 „ „ Sea of Galilee, SANDAY 25-29, 92 f.
 Gergesa, SANDAY 26-28, 93.
 Gerizim, SANDAY 33, 91.
 Gideon, MATHESON 150-171.
 Gifts, Spiritual, GOUDGE 108.
 Gnosticism, BETHUNE-BAKER 72-95.
 God, Existence, JOSEPH 51-59.
 „ Making, ROBERTSON 101-209.
 God and Man, JOSEPH 112-126.
 „ in Man, JOSEPH 84-98.
 „ Origen's Doctrine, BETHUNE-BAKER 145-154.
 „ Teaching, ROBERTSON 210-288.
 „ Tertullian's Doctrine, BETHUNE-BAKER 138-144.
 Golden Gate, SANDAY 64-67, 106, 110.
 Golgotha, SANDAY 19, 54 f., 79 ff.
 Government in Early Europe, JONES 301-327.
 Greece, SOUTTAR 341-518.
 Heaven and Hell in Apocrypha, DODS 101-156.
 „ „ „ Babylonian, DODS 8-27.
 „ „ „ in Early Christianity, DODS 157-170.
 „ „ „ Greek and Roman, DODS 28-82.
 „ „ „ in Mediæval Church, DODS 171-268.
 „ „ „ Visions of, DODS 1.
 Hebrews, SOUTTAR 191-276.
 Hedonism, MOORE 59-109.
 Herod's Palace, SANDAY 14, 52-55, 91.
 „ Temple, SANDAY 106-115.
 Hezekiah, MATHESON 242-264.
 History, Value, LILLY 1-46.
 Holy Sepulchre, Church of, SANDAY 8 ff., 20, 67-77.
 Holy Spirit in Church and on Humanity, *Scottish Church Society* 13-34.
 „ „ and Church Order, *Sc. Ch. Soc.* 217-229.
 „ „ Early Church Doctrine, BETHUNE-BAKER 197-238.
 „ „ and Ministry, *Sc. Ch. Soc.* 161-216.
 „ „ „ Ordinances, *Sc. Ch. Soc.* 52-81.
 „ „ „ Prayer, *Sc. Ch. Soc.* 93-110.
 „ „ „ Redemption, *Sc. Ch. Soc.* 13-34.
 „ „ „ Sacraments, *Sc. Ch. Soc.* 111-160.
 Hospitality in Early Church, JONES 390-405.
 Humanitarianism in N.T., JONES 57-76.
 „ „ O.T., HEUVER 43-56.
 Ideal, MOORE 183-225.
 Immortality, SHALER 286-346.
 Incarnation in Browning, HUTTON 117-148.
 Individual and Individuality, SHALER 1.
 Inquisition, LILLY 297-334.
 Inspiration, ROTHERHAM 7-26; BETHUNE-BAKER 41-61.
 „ of Apostles, GOUDGE 68 f.
 Intermediate State, GAYFORD 23 ff.
 Interpretation, BETHUNE-BAKER 49-61.
 „ „ Gentile, BETHUNE-BAKER 72-94.
 „ „ Jewish, BETHUNE-BAKER 62-71.
 Invocation of Saints, GAYFORD 61 ff.
 Isaiah, MATHESON 265-287.
 Ishmael, MATHESON 1-21.
 James (St.) in Spain, WEBSTER 11-36.
 Jeremiah, MATHESON 288-308.
 Jerusalem, SANDAY Index.
 „ Plan, SANDAY 118 f.
 „ Sites in, SANDAY 51-90.
 „ „ outside, SANDAY 20-50.
 Jewish Inscriptions, COOKE 341 f.
 Jonah, MATHESON 217-241.
 Jonathan, MATHESON 172-194.
 John the Baptist, SANDAY 34-36.
 Josephus, SANDAY 53 f., 106-118.
 Judaism, JOSEPH 1; WERNLE 12-30.

- Judaism, Ceremonial, JOSEPH 177-320.
 „ Literature, JOSEPH xix f.
 „ Mission, JOSEPH 150-176.
 „ Moral Duties, JOSEPH 321-509.
 Justin Martyr, MEANS 64-122.
 Kingdom of God, GOUDGE 51 f.
 Knowledge, Theory, MARVIN 337-450.
 Lamennais and Maurice, WEBSTER 215-238.
 Last Judgment, GAYFORD 88-122.
 Latin Church, MEANS 281-349.
 Law, Christian, WESTCOTT 18-29.
 „ in Early Europe, JONES 328-365.
 Legos Doctrine, BETHUNE-BAKER 119-137.
 Longevity, SHALER 43 ff.
 Lord's Supper, Words of Institution, GOUDGE 102-108.
 Lot, MATHESON 22-42.
 Loyola and the Counter Reformation, WEBSTER 99-115.
 Magadan, SANDAY 22.
 Magdala, SANDAY 22, 24.
 Magdalutha, SANDAY 23.
 Malta, Punic Inscriptions, COOKE 102 ff.
 Man, Divine in, JOSEPH 84-98.
 „ Doctrine in Early Church, BETHUNE-BAKER 301-355.
 „ Free, JOSEPH 99-111.
 Manichæism, BETHUNE-BAKER 95 ff.
 Marriage, Christian, LILLY 335-358.
 „ in Early Europe, JONES 139-153.
 „ „ St. Paul, GOUDGE 63 ff.
 Marseilles, Punic Inscriptions, COOKE 112 ff.
 Martyrs, Age of, LILLY 88-130.
 Maurice and Lamennais, WEBSTER 215-238.
 Mediæval Church, LILLY 162-243, 244-296.
 Medes and Persians, SOUTTAR 145-190.
 Megiddo, SANDAY 30.
 Melchizedek, MATHESON 43-61.
 Mephibosheth, MATHESON 195-216.
 Millennial Reign of Christ, GOUDGE 163.
 Mind, Philosophy, MARVIN 125-177.
 Miracles of Jesus, WRIGHT 1.
 „ „ „ Apologetic Value, WRIGHT 3-14.
 „ „ „ Classification, WRIGHT 37 ff.
 „ „ „ Moral Value, WRIGHT 14-20.
 Moabite Stone, COOKE 1-15.
 Molinos (Miguel de), WEBSTER 136-157.
 Monarchianism, BETHUNE-BAKER 96-112.
 Motion, MARVIN 79 ff.
 Mystery in New Testament, ROBINSON 234-240.
 Mysticism, Spanish, WEBSTER 136-157.
 Nabatean Inscriptions, COOKE 214-264.
 Nablus, SANDAY 31, 103.
 Nahum, SANDAY 43.
 Nain, SANDAY 24, 101.
 Nature, Philosophy, MARVIN 15-124.
 Nazareth, SANDAY Index.
 Nestorianism, BETHUNE-BAKER 255-279.
 New Moon, JOSEPH 250-257.
 „ Year, JOSEPH 250-257.
 Old Age, SHALER 262-277.
 „ „ Utilization, SHALER 278-285.
 Ontology, MARVIN 178-216.
 Ordination, *Sc. Ch. Soc.* 177-216.
 Origen, MEANS 203-280.
 Orientation, SANDAY 85 f.
 Others, Duties to, JOSEPH 394-404.
 Pain, Mystery, JOSEPH 127-137.
 Palestine, Recent Literature, SANDAY 90-105.
 „ Sites, SANDAY 1.
 „ in Time of Christ, SANDAY 1-19; HEUVER 1-42.
 Palmyrene Inscriptions, COOKE 265-340.
 Parent and Child, SHALER 251-261.
 Passover, JOSEPH 215-226.
 Paul, MEANS 1-63; WERNLE 158-359.
 „ Anti-Judaism, WERNLE 290-320.
 „ Apostle to Gentiles, WERNLE 174-222.
 „ Call, WERNLE 158-173.
 „ Gnosis, WERNLE 321-340.
 „ Personal Religion, WERNLE 341-359.
 „ Soteriology, WERNLE 228-289.
 „ Theology, WERNLE 223-340.
 Pentecost, JOSEPH 227-238.
 Petite Eglise, WEBSTER 199-214.
 Philosophy, History of, MARVIN 565 ff.
 „ as a Science, MARVIN 521-564.
 „ Systematic, MARVIN 1.
 Phœnicia, SOUTTAR 277-306.
 Phœnician Inscriptions, COOKE 18-158.
 Praetorium, SANDAY 53 ff., 91.
 Prayer for the Departed, GAYFORD 51 ff.
 „ in Judaism, JOSEPH 342-356.
 Presbyterian Experiment in England, HENSON 76-124.
 Probability, MARVIN 116 ff.
 Progress, WESTCOTT 66-76.
 Property in Early Europe, JONES 216-230.
 Religion, JOSEPH 3-14.
 „ Comparison, ROBERTSON 54-100.
 „ in Early Europe, JONES 451-534.
 „ Philosophy, MARVIN 451-488.
 „ Rationale of, ROBERTSON 1-100.
 Renunciation, Religion of, MACDONALD 79-160.
 Resurrection of Body, GAYFORD 70-87.
 „ „ the Body, GOUDGE 135 f.
 „ „ Christians, GOUDGE 159 ff.
 Rome, SOUTTAR 519, 712.
 Sabbatarianism, HENSON 35-75.
 Sabbath, JOSEPH 202-214.
 Sacrifice in Genesis and Exodus, GOLD 3-42.
 „ „ N.T. and Church, GOLD 79-112.
 „ „ Temple, GOLD 43-78.
 Safed, SANDAY 39, 49.
 Salim, SANDAY 23, 33-35, 91.
 Samaria, City, SANDAY 19.
 „ District, SANDAY 16.
 Sardinia Punic Inscriptions, COOKE 108 ff.
 „ New Punic Inscriptions, COOKE 158.
 Seals and Gems, North-Sem., COOKE 360 ff.
 Self, Duties to, JOSEPH 364-393.
 Separatism; Jewish, JOSEPH 180-195.
 Service, Highest, JOSEPH 138 ff.
 „ Religion of, MACDONALD 1-78.
 „ Social, WESTCOTT 1-18, 44-54.
 Siloam Inscription, COOKE 15 ff.
 Sin and Grace in Early Church, BETHUNE-BAKER 301-326.

Sincerity, JOSEPH 297-309.
 Slavery in Early Europe, JONES 231-259.
 Space and Time, MARVIN 99 ff.
 Spain, Church, Hispanism in, WEBSTER 158-176.
 " " to 1090, WEBSTER 78-98.
 " Early Christian Epitaphs, WEBSTER 61-78.
 " Ecclesiastical Appointments, WEBSTER 253-265.
 " New Year's Eve, WEBSTER 266-275.
 " St. James in, WEBSTER 11-36.
 State, Duties to, JOSEPH 483-498.
 Sychar, SANDAY 31-33, 91.
 Sympathy, Growth, SHALER 106-148.
 Synagogue, JOSEPH 202-214.
 Tabernacles, JOSEPH 239-249.
 Temple, SANDAY Index.
 " of Herod, SANDAY 106-115.

Teresa, Santa, WEBSTER 116-135.
 Tertullian, MEANS 281-349.
 Tiberias, SANDAY 5, 13, 46, 102.
 Toleration, HENSON 211-265.
 Tongues, Gift, GOUDGE 133 ff.
 Translation of Sacred Books, ROTHERHAM 53-63.
 Transmission of Sacred Books, ROTHERHAM 27-52.
 Trinity, Early Church Doctrine, BETHUNE-BAKER 197-238.
 " Method of Revelation, GOUDGE 22.
 Truthfulness, JOSEPH 433 ff.
 Valdés (Juan de), WEBSTER 136-157.
 Valour, SHALER 188-202.
 Warfare in Early Europe, JONES 366-389.
 Wisdom in St. Paul, GOUDGE 20 f.
 Woman in Early Europe, JONES 184-198.
 Worship, Public, in Judaism, JOSEPH 290-296.

Point and Illustration.

Is it possible yet to quote Mr. Gladstone in the pulpit without being called a political parson? If it is, there are telling things in Morley's *Life* (Macmillan; 3 vols., 42s. net). Here, as 'P. and I.' for the present month, will be found some of them. But their force will be properly felt only by those who get the book and read them in their place.

A Religious Exercise.—I cannot help here recording that this matter of speaking is really my strongest religious exercise. On all occasions, and to-day especially, was forced upon me the humiliating sense of my inability to exercise my reason in the face of the House of Commons, and of the necessity of my utterly failing, unless God gave me the strength and language. It was after all a poor performance, but would have been poorer had He never been in my thoughts as a present and powerful aid.

Not a Blasphemous Prayer.—Through the debate I felt the most painful depression. Except Mr. Plumptre and Lord John Russell, all who spoke damaged the question to the utmost possible degree. Prayer earnest for the moment was wrong from me in my necessity! I hope it was not a blasphemous prayer, for support in pleading the cause of justice.

Incessant Wrestling.—Strength of will found scope for exercise where some would not discover the need of it. In native capacity for righteous anger he abounded. The flame soon kindled, and it was no fire of straw; but it did not master him. Mrs. Gladstone once said to me (1891), that whoever writes his life must remember that he had two sides—one impetuous, the other all self-control, able to dismiss all but the great central aim, able to put aside what is weakening or disturbing; that he achieved this self-mastery, and had succeeded in the struggle ever since he was three or four and twenty, first by the natural power of his character, and second by incessant wrestling in prayer—prayer that had been abundantly answered.

One with His Will.—The final state which we are to contemplate with hope, and to seek by discipline, is that in which our will shall be one with the will of God; not merely shall submit to it, not merely shall follow after it, but shall live and move with it, even as the pulse of the blood in the extremities acts with the central movement of the heart.

Ambition.—Once in a conversation with Mr. Gladstone, some fifty years from the epoch of this present chapter, we fell upon the topic of ambition. 'Well,' he said, 'I do not think that I can tax myself in my own life with ever having been much moved by ambition.' The remark so astonished me that, as he afterwards playfully reported to a friend, I almost jumped up from my chair. We soon shall reach a stage in his career when both remark and surprise may explain themselves. We shall see that if ambition means love of power or fame for the sake of glitter, decoration, external renown, or even dominion and authority on their own account, then his view of himself was just. I think he had none of it. Ambition in a better sense, the motion of a resolute and potent genius to use strength for the purposes of strength, to clear the path, dash obstacles aside, force good causes forward—such a quality as that is the very law of the being of a personality so vigorous, intrepid, confident, and capable as his.

Right and Wrong.—At nearly every stage of Mr. Gladstone's active career the vital problem stares us in the face, of the correspondence between the rule of private morals and of public. Is the rule one and the same for individual and for state? From these early years onwards, Mr. Gladstone's whole language and the moods that it reproduces,—his vivid denunciations, his sanguine expectations, his rolling epithets, his aspects and appeals and points of view,—all take for granted that right and wrong depend on the same set of maxims in public life and private. The puzzle will often greet us, and here it is enough to glance at it. In every statesman's case it arises; in Mr. Gladstone's it is cardinal and fundamental.

Over-Refining.—It is idle to ignore in Mr. Gladstone's style an over-refining in words, an excess of qualifying propositions, a disproportionate impressiveness in verbal shadings without real difference. Nothing irritated opponents more. They insisted on taking literary sin for moral obliquity, and because men could not understand, they assumed that they wished to mislead. Yet if we remember how carelessness in words, how the slovenly combination under the same name of things entirely different, how the taking for granted as a matter of positive proof what is at the most only possible, or barely probable—when we think of all the mischief and folly that has been wrought in the world by loose habits of mind that are almost as much the master vice of the head, as selfishness is the master vice of the heart, men may forgive Mr. Gladstone for what passed as sophistry and subtlety, but was in truth scruple of conscience in that region where lack of scruple half spoils the world.

Italian Preaching.—The fundamental distinction be-

tween English and Italian preaching is, I think, this : The mind of the English preacher or reader of sermons, however impressive, is fixed mainly upon his composition, that of the Italian on his hearers. The Italian is a man applying himself by his rational and persuasive organs to men in order to move them ; the former is a man applying himself, with his best ability in many cases, to a fixed form of matter in order to make it move those whom he addresses. The action in the one case is warm, living, direct, immediate, from heart to heart ; in the other it is transfused through a medium comparatively torpid. The first is surely far superior to the second in truth and reality. The preacher bears an awful message. Such messengers, if sent with authority, are too much identified with and possessed by that which they carry to view it objectively during its delivery ; it absorbs their very being and all its energies ; they are their message, and they see nothing extrinsic to themselves except those to whose hearts they desire to bring it.

The Date of Polycarp's Martyrdom.

BY PROFESSOR W. M. RAMSAY, LL.D. D.C.L., ABERDEEN.

THE date of the martyrdom of Polycarp was generally considered to have been settled by Mr. Waddington. Polycarp was burned in the stadium at Smyrna on Saturday, 23rd February, in the year when Quadratus was proconsul governing the province of Asia. The 23rd February fell on a Saturday in the years 155 and 166 A.D. Now in which of those years was Quadratus proconsul of Asia? If we had a complete list of the proconsuls of Asia (who with the rarest exceptions governed for one year), the date would be certain ; but there are many gaps in the list, and not many of the proconsuls are fixed with certainty to a definite year. About the period 150–170 there are unfortunately no dates fixed with certainty for the ten or more proconsuls who are known to have governed Asia. The question, though it looks very simple, is really a most complicated one, as the whole life of Aristides must be moved up or down to suit the date assigned to Quadratus. Eusebius favours the later date.

Mr. Waddington, in a paper of extraordinary acuteness, ingenuity, and learning on the life of the rhetorician Aristides, a friend of the Proconsul Quadratus, established with great probability (but not with conclusive certainty) that Quadratus governed and Polycarp died in 155 A.D. The evidence was rather thin, and depended on a series

of long drawn out inferences ; but Mr. Waddington did all that skill could do, and it was generally agreed that, until new evidence was discovered, the matter must rest as he had left it. At any moment an inscription may be found which shall fix with absolute certainty the date of the Proconsul Quadratus. As yet the decisive inscription has not been discovered ; but something has been done ; and it is worth while, in face of some contrary arguments, to point out that new positive evidence tends to support Mr. Waddington against the elaborate arguments which some German scholars have brought forward in criticism of his chronology.

In the *Rheinisches Museum*, 1893, p. 53 ff., Mr. W. Schmid published a paper on the life of Aristides, in which, from some unobserved notes in two of the MSS, he argued that the later dates for the whole series of his works must be preferred ; and therefore that a Proconsul Quadratus must have governed and Polycarp died in 166 A.D.

Waddington's reasoning was founded on the fact that Aristides mentions a Proconsul Julianus (whom Waddington places nine years before Quadratus). Now epigraphic and numismatic evidence proves that a Proconsul Claudius Julianus¹ governed Asia

¹ The first two letters of the name *Ἰουλιανός* in the inscription are restored ; the date is given by the inscription and the coin, though Schmid interprets the latter differently.

in 145 A.D. Waddington concluded that these two were the same person; and hence he placed Quadratus nine years later, in 154-155 A.D. But Schmid pointed out that Julianus was a common Roman name, and that there was a distinguished Roman official named Salvius Julianus, who was consul in 148 A.D., and therefore might possibly have governed Asia about 157-162 A.D. He argued that this Salvius Julianus was the proconsul mentioned by Aristides as a predecessor of Quadratus; and that the interval between the two was shorter than Waddington allowed.

Schmid's arguments partly convinced Professor Harnack, in his *Chronologie der altchristl. Litteratur*, p. 353 f. He adopted the chronology which Schmid proposed for the life of Aristides; but for Polycarp's death he clung to Waddington's date, defending it by a device taken from Schmid. As Schmid had supposed that there were two proconsuls of Asia named Julianus, so Harnack supposed that there were two proconsuls of Asia named Quadratus, one in 155 (when Polycarp died) and the other eleven years later. But this is turning chronological reasoning into an absurdity; if such methods and suppositions are permitted, the whole subject becomes a joke or a riddle. Such improbable suppositions are not allowed to ordinary historical investigators; only students of Christian history *quibus est nihil negatum* employ them. A right instinct, as I believe, guided Harnack; but his means were unjustifiable.

If Schmid's chronological scheme be right, the date of Polycarp's death must go accordingly. But it is not right; though he seems, unfortunately, to have convinced Professor Dessau, in *Prosopographia Imperii Romani*, iii. p. 166. It is apparent, however, that Dessau had not examined the matter carefully, but simply followed the latest authority; in his gigantic undertaking it was hardly possible to investigate minutely every small detail. There are many other objections to make to Schmid's chronology; but they need not be stated, for one conclusive disproof has recently been discovered. Hitherto Mommsen, and following him Dessau, maintained that the famous jurist Salvius Julianus, the great African, was a different person from Salvius Julianus consul in 148; the reason being that the jurist, who was already famous under Hadrian, must have reached the consulship before 148 A.D. But Mommsen has since then recognized the error of that purely *a priori* argument; and

he not long ago, in one of his latest articles,¹ described the whole career of Salvius Julianus according to an inscription recently found in Africa. The jurist attained the consulship only in 148, as we have recently learned on indubitable evidence, and as Borghesi and others had maintained until Mommsen's time. The result of the new evidence is that Salvius Julianus never governed Asia, for he was proconsul of Africa, and it was not permitted that the same person should hold both of those high offices. That rule is well known; and the objection is final and unsurmountable.

The Julianus of Aristides must therefore be the proconsul of 145, unless another be invented, which no one is likely to venture to do. Accordingly, Schmid has carried Waddington's dating one step onwards towards certainty, instead of shattering it. Waddington's identifications of the proconsuls were the mature result of careful unprejudiced study of the evidence. Schmid's attempted identifications were the work of one who had to find proconsuls in order to bolster up a theory. Waddington's identifications were founded on the established principles of Roman official service; Schmid's were built up on vague suppositions, and required the admission of several exceptions to the rule of the service. Waddington's chronology is not certain, and moreover it is not perfect. A new discussion of the whole subject is needed, which will profit by some useful criticisms made by Schmid, and utilize some recent evidence (unknown to Waddington); but one seems to see the issue. Waddington will be modified in several details. The life of Aristides will be settled on a firmer and truer basis. But the date of the proconsulship of Quadratus will probably remain as Waddington has fixed it; and his general scheme of chronology will stand, though with several improvements in details. We are still, however, waiting for the inscription that will give definite certainty.

After the above paper was partly written I read Corssen's excellent article on the same side in *Zft. f. d. N.T. Wissenschaft*, 1902, p. 61 ff. I have avoided repeating any of his arguments; and have cut down, at the risk of obscurity, a longer article. Those who desire a fuller discussion may consult his paper. But he has not observed the important bearing of the new inscription of Salvius Julianus on the Polycarp controversy. In it we have no longer a mere general train of argument, but a hard fact with which to confront Schmid's reasoning.

¹ *Savigny Zeitschrift für Rechtsgeschichte*, xxiii. 54.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Was Jesus Ekstatiker? ¹

PROFESSOR OSCAR HOLTZMANN has written a supplement to his *Leben Jesu* (noticed in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, vol. xiii. No. 11) under what most people will think a singularly ill-chosen title. It is a saying of Wellhausen that the transition from ecstasy to piety, begun by the prophets and continued by later believers, was made complete by Jesus; but this judgment is so absolute as to offend Professor Holtzmann's historical sense. Bernhard Weiss had also spoken some strong words to very much the same effect, but we are now told that Strauss and Renan are really far better guides to the understanding of Jesus' inner life, when they point to the rising tide of mistaken hopes and enthusiasm that gradually overflowed His mind. If our picture of Christ is to be complete, we must not forget the fanatical and all but frenzied strain that showed in Him again and again.

This is the tone in which the book opens, and we brace ourselves for the shock of extremely revolutionary opinions. Still let us inquire, what does Holtzmann mean by calling Jesus an ecstatic? It is significant that the term occurs but once in the Gospels, when His mother and brethren said, 'He is beside himself' (ἐλεγον γάρ, ὅτι ἐξέστη). Here, says our author, we may find the decisive marks of an ecstatic. 'He acts as the instrument of a spirit other than his own, as is shown by sudden or passionate deeds; he speaks what the spirit says or shows to him, as is evident when his language suddenly rises above its ordinary level, or exhibits a power and force out of keeping with its natural character.' Confusion is bound to result, no doubt, when such a definition is applied to Jesus Christ, but it is clear that already the conception 'ecstatic' promises to be something a good deal less hysterical and bizarre than at first seemed likely. And this impression is confirmed by the examples of ecstasy adduced in the pages that follow. Not only are the Baptism and the Temptation times of peculiar ecstasy, but Jesus' belief that He is the Messiah, and that the

kingdom of God is near, is also ecstatic; so are His praise of self-denial, His statement to Peter about building His Church 'on this rock,' His words to the woman who anointed Him 'for burial,' His general bearing at the Last Supper, and His saying 'this is my body.' It is obvious from all this that 'ecstasy,' vaguely as Holtzmann uses the word, need mean no more than inspiration or exalted feeling, and to say that at times Jesus rose to unwonted heights of spiritual emotion, is to say nothing that is not perfectly familiar to every careful reader of the Gospels. Once the word 'ecstasy,' in its technically theological sense however, is used of such feelings, we are implicitly asked to believe that there was something in Jesus essentially akin to the state of demented rapture and passionate excitement in which the early prophets lost their self-consciousness, and which was sometimes indistinguishable from madness.² To think that a phenomenon like this helps us to interpret Jesus is a pure mistake; and it is difficult to refrain from derision as Professor Holtzmann, with a perseverance from which a sense of humour would have saved him, proceeds to explain in the new light saying after saying about which no real difficulty need ever have been found. What confusion and blindness to real moral issues can thus be imported into the exegesis of simple gospel statements may be seen from the following specimen: 'It is not common for an ecstatic to tranquillise other men; he rather works infectiously on his surroundings; and thus we can understand how Jesus could say of Himself that He brought not peace on earth but a sword.'

But, of course, Holtzmann does not believe that Jesus was an ecstatic and no more. He possessed a quiet and steadfast inner character, which predominated over the other strain. Nay, He may justly be described as a foe to ecstasy; so that in the fifth chapter of this book the conclusions earlier arrived at are considerably toned down. It is shown very ably that, after all, Jesus' attitude to the state, civilization, work, and other elements in a complete human life was one of positive approval. But how Professor Holtzmann, in the light of his presuppositions, should accept these features in the

¹ *Eine Untersuchung zum Leben Jesu.* Von D. Oscar Holtzmann, a.o. Professor der Theologie zu Giessen. Williams & Norgate, 1903. Price 3s.

² Cf. Mr. Bruce Taylor's admirable remarks, *E.T.* xiii. No. 5, pp. 227-228.

historical portrait of Christ as authentic, is an unexplained mercy.

In conclusion, we are told that it was the force of ecstasy which moved Jesus to the preaching of the gospel and made Him the leader of an incipient Church. There are mutable ingredients in that gospel so far as its contents are ecstatic; but even here ecstasy may have brought gain as well as loss. It gave Christ His faith in His own Messiahship, without which Christianity could never have been. The chief gain to be expected from a work like his own, Professor Holtzmann thinks, is that it shows us a clearer and more living picture of Jesus, and presents that combination of antagonistic and conflicting elements which is often the most attractive vein in a great personality.

The theological defects of the book are hardly compensated for by its literary qualities, for it maintains only too well the reputation of Germany as 'the home of invertebrate prose.' The author has fallen a victim, we are afraid, to the idea that a problem has been solved when a new technical term has been invented to describe it. 'Ekstatiker' is a category which is not likely to have a great future in the interpretation of the person of Jesus, and in Holtzmann's hands it has neither the unity nor the clearness which we demand from conceptions that claim to modify our thoughts about Christ's inner life. Was it worth while, indeed, to write such a book? We can applaud it only on the principle that out of the violent clash of opinions, even the most extreme, there may now and then chance to be struck a spark of true fire, which, caught up by the wise, may one day come to burn with the light of higher and clearer knowledge.

H. R. MACKINTOSH.

Aberdeen.

Professor von Dobschütz on the Resurrection History.¹

DR. VON DOBSCHÜTZ, whose valuable work in the *Primitive Christian Communities* is soon to appear in an English dress, has recently published a booklet entitled *Easter and Pentecost*, in which he discusses in a fresh and vital way the accounts of our Lord's Resurrection in the light of the oldest

apostolic formula, and of St. Paul's witness, as both are given in 1 Co 15. The little treatise, whose value is out of all proportion to its size, is dedicated to Dr. Ad. Hilgenfeld, 'the Nestor of our University' (Jena). In it we have a shining example of the freest historical criticism wedded to a profound faith in the fundamental facts of the Church's Confession. We are reminded of a serious lack in English apologetic literature, as we read the German theologian's paper. With all the strength and robustness which characterize the writings of such men as the late Bishop Westcott and Professor Milligan, one is conscious that they never came to terms with the *history* of the Resurrection as we have it in the Gospels, never tried to account for that history and to get at the realities which it imperfectly shadows forth. To leave the narratives as they stand, or to seek to harmonize them in a mechanical way, must always prove unsatisfying. On the other hand, it is hard to ask us to acquiesce in the agnostic despair of history to which Dr. Harnack feels himself driven, and which regards the problem of what happened on the first Easter morning as absolutely insoluble. Dr. von Dobschütz steers his way between these extremes.

His discussion falls into three parts: (1) the Empty Grave, (2) the Appearances of the Risen Lord, (3) Pentecost.

As to the Empty Grave, he finds that the common element in the collective tradition is the discovery of the grave open and empty, and the angelic message to the disciples, through the women, to go to Galilee, where the risen Lord would meet them. The appearances at Jerusalem must be set aside as owing partly to a confusion with the Galilean appearances, and partly to a later traditional growth. Is it objected that the angelic apparition must be deemed unhistorical—the creation of mythical fancy? Be it so. Nevertheless, the naked fact remains: the women on Easter morning found the grave open and empty. It is, indeed, said that St. Paul knows nothing of this alleged fact, and that his silence almost amounts to a disproof. Dr. von Dobschütz, on the contrary, maintains that not only the formula of 1 Co 15⁴, going back to a pre-Pauline tradition, but the apostle's dogmatic discussion in vv.³⁵⁻⁵⁴ when compared with v.²⁰ and following, presuppose the idea of the empty grave. To those at Corinth who denied the possibility of a resurrection of the

¹ *Ostern und Pfingsten. Eine Studie zu 1 Kor. 15.* Von E. von Dobschütz. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung. Pp. 54.

dead—(though they admitted Christ's)—on the ground that they could not conceive *how* it could take place, St. Paul replies by setting the Resurrection of Christ in the closest connexion with that of all Christian believers: the latter is guaranteed by the former. The body remains: it is its matter that is changed. An analogy is found in the change that takes place in a corn of wheat when sown in the earth. St. Paul's idea of the Resurrection is modelled on that of Christ's—an idea as much removed from the sensuous conceptions of the Rabbis as from the ultra-spiritualism of the Greek philosophers. But the Pauline view goes back to that of the primitive disciples.

Again, the phrase in the apostolic formula, 'He was buried,' is very significant. Its motive is not merely, as is commonly supposed, to emphasize the full reality of our Lord's death, but to point to the grave as the state from which the Resurrection must take place. It is noteworthy also that there is no allusion to scriptural proof for His burial as in the case of His Death and Resurrection. Justin Martyr (*Dial. cum Tryph.* 7. 118) adduces proof from Is 53⁹ and 57². A striking illustration of the falsity of making the Old Testament responsible for the origin of the gospel tradition!

Yet the belief in the Empty Grave is by no means equivalent to faith in the Resurrection. The wish to set forth the Resurrection as an event open to historical proof, like any other event, attaches itself to the Empty Grave as an indubitable proof. On the other hand, those who feel that an object of faith cannot be something historically provable, refer the Easter-message of the women to the region of legend and poetry. Both views are false. 'That the grave was found open and empty on the third day by some women is historically certain, but it is just as certain that this did not result directly in the Easter faith.' Where is the joy of assurance in the words which, according to modern criticism, close St. Mark's Gospel: 'for they (the women) were afraid.' No! Faith in the Resurrection does not depend on the Empty Grave, but on the self-witness of the living Lord. Theories, indeed, have been devised in order to account for the women's discovery on purely materialistic grounds; the Wolfenbüttel Fragmentist attributes the disappearance of the body to the disciples, while Réville and O. Holtzmann deem the Jews and the owner of the garden respectively the responsible agents. 'Faith knows

another explanation, and need not be put out by any dictum of natural science; but this is won not by empirical investigation, rather is it an assertion of faith whose certainty does not rest on external facts, but on personal relation to Christ.'

As to the appearances of the risen Lord, neither their nature nor succession can be clearly made out. Still we know that after the discovery of Easter morning, the disciples were drawn to Galilee, not indeed with joyful hope, yet not without a ray of hope that there they would see the Master again. St. Luke and St. John transfer all the appearances to Jerusalem. Reasons for this tradition are obvious. A later time felt that the witnesses to the Resurrection could not be so far separated from the event. Moreover, as the third day was the day of the emergence from the tomb, must it not also have been the day of His self-manifestation? Doubtless there were traditions of appearances at Jerusalem to less known disciples. Could these have precedence of St. Peter and the Eleven?

Space does not allow us to follow Dr. von Dobschütz further. His discussion of the meaning of the Pentecost is most interesting and illuminating. The pouring forth of the Spirit is the way in which the author of Acts describes a Christophancy. Thus Easter and Pentecost stand in vital connexion. But we can only mention these points, not discuss them. All theological students must thank the Jena professor for this timely, scholarly, and reassuring little book.

SAMUEL M'COMB.

Queen's University, Canada.

Plenary Indulgences and the Reformation.¹

THESE little books, the one viii and 160 pages, and the other vii and 212 pages long, are part of

¹ *Documente zum Ablassstreit von 1517.* Herausgegeben von Lic. Theol. Dr. W. Köhler, Privatdozenten an der Universität Giessen. Tübingen und Leipzig: J. C. B. Mohr, 1892. Price 3s. (Sammlung ausgewählter kirchen- und dogmen-geschichtlicher Quellenschriften. Zweite Reihe. Drittes Heft).—*Luthers 95 Thesen samt seinen Resolutionen sowie den Gegenschriften von Wimpina Tetzel, Eck und Prierias und den Antworten Luthers darauf. Kritische Ausgabe mit kurzen Erläuterungen.* Von Lic. Dr. W. Köhler, Privatdozenten an der Universität Giessen. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1903. Price 3s.

a process, going on extensively at present in Germany, of constructing a royal road to learning. They are both meant to place within the reach of every student of Church history a series of original documents which will enable him to trace the gradual growth of the system of granting Plenary Indulgences in the Mediæval Church up to the great controversy waged against the system by Luther, which formed the first stage of the Reformation.

The former of the two books contains the important portions of most of the official documents from the beginning of the eleventh century downwards, which mark the growth of the conception and practice of Plenary Indulgences, on to the end of the fifteenth century. The selection has been carefully made, and deserves the highest praise. I suspect that one who has painfully exhumed such documents for himself has always some criticisms to make when he goes over the selection made by another. Thus I am surprised at the omission of Pope Urban II.'s Indulgence for the Crusade, of date 9th September 1090, and the substitution of the somewhat doubtful speech of the pope at the Council of Clermont. The highly important Jubilee Indulgence Bull of 1499 has not found a place. The reader must be warned against one set of extracts—those from what is called the *Rombüchlein*. They are not quite what they ought to be. Perfect impartiality ought to have made Dr. Köhler include the sentences which occur more than once, that the indulgences promised include 'Culpa' as well as 'Poena'; the words in the German version are 'von Pein und Schuld.' It is something, however, to get the text of Pope Leo's Indulgence Bull of 1515 printed for the first time from the rare Munich manuscript.

In the second book Dr. Köhler completes his collection of original authorities by condensing for us the most important writings which the Lutheran Indulgence controversy gave rise to. His method is a very convenient one for the student. The ninety-five Theses are printed one after another. Under each thesis are printed the portions of Luther's *Resolutions*, which give his detailed and deliberate explanation of what he had meant to set forth in each thesis. These *Resolutions* were the most carefully done bit of literary work which Luther ever published. He thought long over them, and rewrote them several times. It is very useful to have them broken up in this

way, and set immediately under the thesis they are meant to explain. Then Dr. Köhler has collected the sentences from the Wimpina-Tetzel Counter-Theses from the *Obelisks* of John Eck, and from the attack by Prierias. Thus the student has all that was said on each point collected together. The work seems to be well done on the whole, and pains have been taken to secure a critically good text. T. M. LINDSAY.

Glasgow.

A COMPLETE edition in one volume of the New Testament Apocryphal Writings was given to the English-speaking world, a year or two ago, as a volume of the 'Ante-Nicene Library' (T. & T. Clark), and under the capable editorship of Professor Allan Menzies of St. Andrews. Now the same service has been rendered to German-speaking people by Lic. Dr. Edgar Hennecke,¹ Pastor in Betheln, Hannover. He has divided the New Testament Apocrypha into five portions—Gospels, Epistles, Homilies, Writings on Church Government, Apocalypses, and Acts of Apostles. He has found two or three writers for each portion. Each writer gives an introduction and a translation. And he himself completes the book with prefaces and indexes.

The writers include such well-known names as Geffcken, Krüger, Arnold Meyer, Preuschen, Raabe, von Schubert, and Weinelt. Their work is both individual and uniform. The volume is likely to find wide acceptance in this country, the value of the apocryphal writings for the study of the thought and life of the early Church being now well recognized.

Much has been done with the quotations from the Old Testament found in the New. Much has been done to trace their source, and exhibit their parallelism. But the most scientific book, the fullest, the most accurate book on the subject has lately been written by W. Dittmar.² Every phrase that has ever been supposed to be a quotation is considered, the Old Testament is ransacked for its parallels or its origin, the Hebrew and the

¹ *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen*, in deutscher Übersetzung und mit Einleitungen. Herausgegeben von Lic. Dr. Edgar Hennecke. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr; London: Williams & Norgate. Price 6s. net.

² *Vetus Testamentum in Novo*. Von Wilhelm Dittmar. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht; Glasgow: Baumeister. Price 9s. 6d.

Greek are then set down side by side with it; and as if that were not enough, all the Old Testament passages quoted or paraphrased in the New Testament are given in order of their occurrence in the Old Testament, followed by every parallel phrase throughout the whole Bible, including the Apocrypha. The last great service is done in an appendix to the book, an appendix which fills eighty pages of the closest possible printing. It is a truly German work. Its thoroughness is seen in the proof-reading as well as everywhere else. No doubt Dittmar's *Vetus Testamentum in Novo* will displace all previous work on the Quotations.

A new French translation of the Psalter has appeared.¹ It is the work of a Roman Catholic of literary instincts and scientific training, M. B. D'Eyragues. It contains a note of introduction by M. Vigouroux, the editor of the great *Dictionary of the Bible*, and a fuller and more poetical preface by the Archbishop of Paris. The translation is a work of manifest ability, and the notes, though few, are in touch with the latest study of the Bible and Comparative Religion.

The Dictionary of Christian Archaeology.

THE second and third fascicules of Cabrol's great dictionary² have now reached us. The first impression is of its daring magnitude. The page is a very large one with double columns, the type is small, and yet the 895 pages which are now published carry the work down no farther than the word AGNEAU. Africa alone fills exactly 200 pages. It is divided into five parts, each part forming a separate article by a separate author. The parts are (1) Geography and History; (2) Ante-Nicene Liturgy; (3) Post-Nicene Liturgy; (4) Archæology; (5) Philology. The last describes the languages used by the liturgical writers of Christian Africa. It is the work of Dom H. Leclercq of Farnborough.

This introduces the writers, and a curious fact.

¹ *Les Psaumes: traduits de l'Hébreu.* Par M. B. D'Eyragues. Paris: Lecoffre, 1904. Price 7 fr. 50.

² *Dictionnaire d'Archéologie Chrétienne et de Liturgie.* Publié par le R. P. dom Fernand Cabrol. Paris: Letouzey et Ané.

The curious fact is that the work is edited in England; for Dom F. Cabrol, the editor, is living in Farnborough. His staff is a surprisingly small one. Only forty-one names are announced. This we think is a mistake. It is far easier certainly to work with a small staff, but it inevitably means more second-rate work. Some of these men, with all their eminence, will have to get up some subjects for the occasion, keeping out other men who are the first and perhaps only real authorities on these subjects. An editor's business, if we understand it aright, after getting his subject list ready, is to get the very best man for each subject, and sometimes there is only one man for it, and one subject for the man.

But the writers are good. Mgr. Battifol, Abbé Chabot, Professor Cumont, Mgr. Duchesne, Professor Fournier, Dom Leclercq, Professor Martin, Dom Morin—those are among them. They are specialists in the department of liturgies, and being all Frenchmen, they can all write.

The thoroughness of the work is most gratifying. And its value is greatly increased by the plentiful and yet judicious use of illustration.

What a field for the circulation of the work Great Britain affords if the publishers could but make it known. The study of Christian Archæology is spreading rapidly, and this work is unrivalled for the student's purposes—unrivalled and indispensable.

Origen.

THE ninth volume of the new edition of the Greek Christian Writings of the first three centuries has been published. It is the fourth volume of the works of Origen. It contains his Commentary on St. John.³ The editor is Dr. Erwin Preuschen of Darmstadt.

There is an edition of Origen's Commentary on St. John in English, done by a scholar of the first rank. It is natural that we should first of all compare the two editions. What is there in this Commentary that we have not already in Mr. Brooke's?⁴

³ *Origenes' Johanneskommentar.* Herausgegeben im Auftrage der Kirchenväter-Commission der Königl. Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Von Lic. Dr. Erwin Preuschen. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs. M.24.50.

⁴ *The Commentary of Origen on St. John's Gospel.* The text revised, with a Critical Introduction and Indices, by

In the first place, there is a much fuller Introduction in Preuschen than in Brooke. Part of its fulness is due to Mr. Brooke's greater gift of condensation; part, however, is due to the minuter discussion of many matters of importance in the study of the Commentary and of Origen's work in general. There is, for example, in Preuschen a discussion of Origen's method of exegesis and its sources, and of the Scripture text that he uses. In regard to the Commentary itself, there is much new detail on the controversy between Preuschen and Brooke as to the relationship of the two great MSS, Codex Monacensis and Codex Venetus—new even when Brooke's *Fragments of Heracleon* in the 'Cambridge Texts and Studies' is taken into account. Then Dr. Preuschen's indexes are more numerous and more complete than Mr. Brooke's. Mr. Brooke has an index of texts, and an index of Greek words. Dr. Preuschen has them both, but his index of Greek words fills 171 columns; Mr. Brooke's only 18 columns. Dr. Preuschen has other indexes which Mr. Brooke has not at all. Some idea of the magnitude of Preuschen's apparatus will be obtained when it is seen that the volume contains 776 pages, of which the Commentary, including its textual footnotes, fills 574.

The text itself deserves attention. Like Mr. Brooke's, it is a critical text, and it differs from A. E. Brooke, Fellow and Dean of King's College. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1896. 2 vols.

quently though not seriously from Mr. Brooke's text.

All this is no disparagement of Mr. Brooke's edition, so scholarly and so convenient. It is only to say that the fullest apparatus for the student's purposes is in Dr. Preuschen's later and larger work, which is well worth its place in this great series.

A Defence of St. John xxi.

Is the 21st chapter of St. John by the same hand as the twenty chapters that precede it? Lic. Karl Horn¹ holds that it is. He holds that the whole Gospel is the work of the beloved disciple. The twenty-first chapter was written much later than the rest. But that it comes from the same hand is proved by a searching examination of the language and the ideas. The book will be welcomed as at once scholarly and conservative. It is an independent study of the whole subject with which it deals—and that is a larger subject than the determination of the authorship of a single chapter. The most pronounced opponents of the Johannine authorship of the Fourth Gospel will have to reckon with it. The advocates will hail its author as a valiant comrade in the battle.

¹ *Abfassungszeit, Geschichtlichkeit und Zweck von Evang. Joh. Kap. 21.* Ein Beitrag zur johanneischen Frage, von P. Lic. th. Karl Horn. Leipzig: A. Deichert. M.4.

Living in Christ.

By THE REV. A. H. MONCUR SIME, M.A., HUDDERSFIELD.

'That like as Christ was raised from the dead through the glory of the Father, so we also might walk in newness of life.'—Rom. vi. 4 (R.V.).

To the truly creative mind, the FACT is constantly passing into the idea. The event is ever passing into its meaning.

The preacher reads parables in all around him, and interprets Nature by the needs of the Human Spirit. The great personalities of history become mythical behind the effects they have produced, and are always producing.

The critical, sceptical, doubting, suspicious spirit is not thus creative; but having denied the fact,

or thrown as much suspicion as possible upon it, finds no abiding idea. This spirit has no power by which it can interpret the world of history or of present modes; it finds a miracle unhistoric, and has no perception of the spiritual or moral truth, of which the miracle was the symbol.

Perhaps the most powerful and most striking presentation of this spirit in all literature is given by our great dramatist in the personage of Iago, who himself said, 'I am nothing if not critical';

and to Iago's soul-destroying end does all cynical and evil-disposed criticism tend.

All great men, while they may have been critics of the doubtful and the false and the outworn, have, at the same time, been restorers, reformers, and revealers. If Jesus destroyed the temple at Jerusalem, He taught us to find a larger and more sacred one in the earth on which we dwell, under the overarching sky. He replaced the letter by the spirit, and first urged the wisdom and necessity of knowing and judging men by their fruits.

Happy the man who can use the larger and more sacred temple of God—the heavens and the earth—and find the Father everywhere! Such a man has gained, not only intellectual freedom by exchanging a building for a world, but he has gained much more, for now he sees God near to him, realizes His presence and guidance, and holds vital communion with Him; he has gained the freedom of the spirit.

The man who has gained, not spiritual liberty, but mere intellectual leisure, will do well to remain in his old ancestral church; for it is better that he should feel God SOMEWHERE than nowhere. It will be for his spiritual gain to submit to the customs which ages have consecrated to the discipline, if not to the freedom and joy, of worship.

These general observations are suggested by the consideration of this particular part of St. Paul's letter to the Romans, 'as Christ was raised from the dead, so we also might walk in newness of life.' No Christian of the first age believed more profoundly than did Paul in that conception of the resurrection of Christ which is almost the only one prominently before men's minds in the present day: that after three days Jesus rose again in material form; but it is the one aspect to which he refers least often.

To the great apostle, that is the figure, the symbol of a spiritual resurrection—Christ in humanity, the hope of all truth and goodness. With him, the physical passes quite easily, so to speak, into the moral. The fact of the resurrection became a doctrine; men dwelt more upon a LIVING Christ than upon a RISEN one. To Paul himself, Christ was pre-eminently THE LIVING LORD.

There was a long period of nearly twenty years in which Paul worked alone. These were the decisive years in the growth of Christianity. All that distinguishes a world-embracing religion from a sect,

had, during that time, been fixed by his principal writings.

The centre of that universal religion was the person of its founder, who was regarded by James as a Jew, by Peter as the glorified Messiah, by John as the Son of God, but was declared by the writer of the letter to the Romans to be the Christ—the true Son of man, and Son of God. 'God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself.' To know Christ in this truly spiritual sense was Paul's mission, his personal joy, his very life, and his hope for the world. In any other way he did not desire to know Him. There were those who boasted of their privileges as Jews, of their descent from Abraham, of their personal intercourse with Jesus on earth. The Christ, according to the flesh, was the Jewish Messiah of his previous and unconverted state: the Christ he now knew was the Spirit of highest life, drawing men to God.

Some of Paul's theology is separable from his life and experience. It is external, like his use of the Mosaic figures, but the main part of it has its source in his emotions less than in his reason. Or, to put it differently, his emotions were the medium through which religious truths reached him. He determined to know Christ no more after the flesh, that is, the Christ of history, of popular expectations, of fulfilment of the law of sacrifice and of dogma, but only as the Son of God, the spirit of liberty.

The Bible Christology has for its lowest form a national Hero-King, who shall conquer the oppressor; it rises to Paul's conception of a King of Righteousness, saving and inspiring every Christian soul.

If anyone be possessed by Christ in this sense, he is a new creature. His old self, his old aspirations and associations have passed away, all things have indeed become new.

Many attempts have been made to explain the great change that took place in the apostle's mind. It is one of the instances in moral and religious history in which the effects are greater than the known cause. Religious history abounds in these instances.

No one can deny the exquisite grace and tenderness, the infinite charm of the narratives that had gathered round the advent of Jesus, and which are described in the first and second chapters of Luke's Gospel. They have been the source of our religious art from the earliest times. They have

furnished us with the themes of hymns and of music; with subjects for the canvas and pencil of our highest painters; with the symbols both of our thought and our worship. But they do not carry compelling power with them. They are the accessories of a fact greater than themselves, a fact expressed by Paul in our text, the risen Christ, the voluntary bringer of light and love and harmony and life.

Paul, who was the greatest doctrinal teacher of the early Church, to whom we no doubt owe the creeds of Augustine and Calvin, was also one of the most practical of instructors. He taught us to ask ourselves what relation we hold to this living, spiritual force, manifested in Jesus Christ, and what share are we really taking in this resurrection religion which gave new life to the ancient world, and created out of its decaying materials, blended with the forces of new races, a civilization of which the highest minds of paganism never dreamed.

And the appeal this religion makes is not to a physical miracle, but to experience and testimony. If any man be living in this risen, vital Christ, he is a new creature. The miracle of the resurrection is first of all, and most of all, a moral and spiritual one. United to Christ, men are in the way of possessing all that lies within the scope of a perfected humanity; they are rising out of sin into the harmony of God.

'Eternity,' wrote Carlyle, in old age, in the greatest sorrow of his troubled life, 'Eternity is my one strong city. I look into it fixedly now and then. All terrors about it seem to me superfluous; all knowledge about it impossible to living mortals. The Universe is full of love, but also inexorable sternness and severity, and it remains for ever true that God reigns. Patience! Silence! Hope!'

The similarities between this Paul of our modern times and the apostle to the Gentiles are greater and more numerous than their superficial dissimilarities. Both were men of genius above the level of their respective times. Both had passed through a severe mental and moral, aye spiritual struggle, which had issued in comparative certainty. Their differences were largely due to their way of regarding Christianity—due, say some, to their times and conditions. It is a far cry from the first to the nineteenth century. Within every great personality lie hidden the secrets of failures and successes. These are known to God alone; and

it would have been acknowledged by both these apostles that they were due to God's will. Both at least had learned the great truth that in the will of God was their only real peace. To do that will needed an act of surrender, of which Paul could find no image so perfect and complete as the death of Christ on the Cross. That which to the world looked like a shameful, degraded end of a short and useless life, was to him the type and prophecy of the life that was perfect. And he who had tasted death with the Son of man had a right to taste of the tree of life, whose leaves were for the healing of the nations. Men living in and with Christ are to present themselves unto God, as alive from the dead, and their members as instruments of righteousness unto God. Freed from sin they are become servants of righteousness.

The living Christ is the mystery which had been hidden from the ages. The person, the work, the life and death, and continued life of Christ, constituted, in Paul's conception, the Christian Religion. It was the influence of a great religious spirit exercised on the moral condition of its time. That influence was diversified by the temperaments on which it fell, by the nature of the preceding education, by the opinions, beliefs, traditions, and prejudices of the recipients. In every case where the faith of Jesus did its work, the heart was purified, and the will fired and strengthened for right. The speculative and critical intellect, too, was inspired to seek for knowledge through the gift of the spirit of truth. The pursuit of truth was imposed as a duty, but no constraint was exercised on the reason that obeyed. Thus, through the power of a divine love in a divine life, subduing and winning, did the thought of Christ reconcile men to God.

In the universal faith of divine favour bending over the penitent, and lifting up the humble, we have the highest reach of religion.

Every man to whom these mystic words of our text may have reached, or to whom they may yet reach, has, in some symbolic way or other, offered something as a worshipper to God. The worshipper, like the priest, must have somewhat to offer. Some have hoped to win the divine favour by a gift, a sweet-smelling incense, an animal or a plant. Some have sought to earn favour by asceticism and self-inflicted pain. Others still, in different ways.

But to all, awakened from the death of a debased

conscience, and from the corrupt and immoral practices of a pagan religion, either in the first or twentieth century, Paul says out of a great assurance, 'the mind of the flesh is death, but the mind of the spirit is life and peace.' 'Reckon ye also yourselves to be dead unto SIN, but alive unto God in Christ Jesus!'

The law of personal surrender to the Highest, even by the Cross, is shown in a later portion of this same Epistle to be as reasonable as it is sacred. It is the act which results from the coalition of faith with reason. It is based on the conviction of God's wisdom and goodness, and on the experi-

ence of His mercy. It leads to a fuller knowledge of the Perfect Will which is the moral order of our world.

More, it gives to him who habitually commits himself to it, the security of universal law, and the peace of a universal love. 'Great peace have they that love Thy law.'

That the life of surrender in the Spirit of Christ is according to the highest reason, may be seen at once by conceiving its opposite—a life with no duty, no trust, no love, no godly service.

Truly, 'the gift of God is eternal life in Christ Jesus our Lord.'

Recent Biblical and Oriental Archaeology.

BY A. H. SAYCE, D.D., PROFESSOR OF ASSYRIOLOGY, OXFORD.

PROFESSOR CURTISS has just published a very interesting¹ book on the materials still existing in the beliefs and practices of the peasantry of Syria and Palestine for the reconstruction of 'primitive Semitic religion.' The book has been published in both Germany and America, the German edition being the more complete of the two; Dr. Hayes Ward has added an Appendix on the early form of the altar and character of the sacrifice depicted on early Babylonian seal-cylinders, and Count Baudissin has prefixed an Introduction. The value of the text is enhanced by the well-chosen illustrations which are scattered through it.

The book, as Professor Curtiss tells us, is the result of four expeditions in 'Bible-lands.' The object of them was not technically archæological, though incidentally a previously unknown 'high-place' was discovered by the explorer at Petra, and he was able to collect fresh topographical details at Gadis, the ancient Kadesh-barnea. What he was looking for were the survivals of old religious beliefs and usages,—evidences of the ancient faith which still lies deep in the heart of the Oriental peasant and Bedâwi nomad under a thin varnish of Muhammadanism or Christianity. In fact, even the varnish is not always observable.

Professor Curtiss was accompanied in his expeditions by missionaries and natives who were well acquainted with the people. The facts he gives us

may therefore be fully trusted, and the picture they disclose is at once interesting and unexpected. Anthropology has taught us that a conquering race is eventually absorbed into the native population of the country it occupies; we now learn that in the East, at anyrate, the same has been the case as regards religion. Though the unmeaning formulæ of Muhammadanism or Christianity may be upon his lips, the illiterate peasant of Syria is still quite as much a pagan as the wild Bedâwi of the desert. And the paganism is that of a remote past. Like the paganism which the students of folk-lore have discovered, not only in continental Europe, but in our own islands, it is for the most part of a primitive character. Hence Professor Curtiss considers himself justified in believing it to represent the religion of the early Semites. In the existing religious and moral ideas of the Syrian peasant he finds the key to that 'primitive Semitic' religion whose secrets Robertson Smith and Wellhausen have sought to unlock in another way.

That in these ideas we have a survival of the past no anthropologist can doubt. But to what extent that past can be called 'primitive Semitic' is another question. Recent excavations at Gezer have shown that when the Semitic race entered Canaan it was already civilized and acquainted with the use of metals. In so far, therefore, as the beliefs and practices discovered by Professor Curtiss presuppose an uncivilized community they are either examples of degeneration or else go back to

¹ *Ursemitische Religion im Volksleben des heutigen Orients*. By Samuel Ives Curtiss. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1904.

the short, dolichocephalic race which preceded the Semites. Moreover, the area covered by his researches lies within that which for unnumbered centuries was under the influence of Babylonian culture. As we now know, Arabia itself was not exempt from this, indeed it was in Arabia that highly civilized kingdoms arose whose power extended from the south of the peninsula to the confines of Babylonia and Palestine. We can consequently no longer exclude the influence of Babylonia, as Robertson Smith wished to do, even when dealing with the early religion of Arabia, and, as I pointed out at the time, to argue as he has done from the beliefs and practices of the wild Bedâwi of the fourth century to those of the early Semitic is like finding a clue to the origin of British Christianity in the beliefs and customs of the gypsies. Anthropology has forced us to recognize the fact that degeneration has been quite as potent a factor as progress in making man what he is to-day.

Hence, instead of calling the practices and beliefs to which Professor Curtiss' evidence points 'primitive Semitic,' I should prefer to term them 'Syrian' or 'Canaanite.' But the term must be used in a geographical and not a racial sense. Canaan, like Great Britain, has been the meeting-place of many races and many civilizations, and the faith and habit of its peasantry to-day have been necessarily coloured and affected by them all. When we know more about ancient Babylonian religion we shall doubtless discover that much which Professor Curtiss now believes to be of native Canaanitish growth really came from the Sumerian predecessors of the Semite in Babylonia.

Still, when every deduction is made, the broad fact remains that the modern peasant of Syria is predominantly a Semite in race, and that the elements of his religion are predominantly those which we find in the religious systems of the Semitic world. And three of these elements have been brought out by Professor Curtiss' researches into clear relief. One is the belief in the power, as opposed to the moral nature, of God. God is regarded as an absolute tyrant, whose will may not be questioned by His creatures any more than the will of the father may be questioned by his children. So far as His creatures can discover, that will is frequently a mere caprice, which is exercised as often unjustly as justly. But such a belief is not necessarily 'primitive.' It was the

belief of ancient Babylonia, originating partly in the conception of an inexorable law which preserved the universe from falling back into chaos, and which the gods themselves were compelled to obey, and partly in an anthropomorphic idea of the deity which assimilated Him to the ruler of a Babylonian state. Thus an old Babylonian king writes: 'What in itself is good, that is evil with the Trinity; what in itself is bad, that is good with the God; who can understand the counsel of God or discover his dark paths?' Even in Hebrew prophecy we read: 'I form the light and create darkness; I make peace and create evil; I the Lord do all these things.'

One result of this conception of God is that He is kept out of sight as much as possible. The peasant prefers to escape His notice as he would that of a tyrannical Turkish governor. The powers whom he really worships and propitiates are the shêkhs of Muhammadanism, the saints of Christianity. They are but the old local deities—the Baalim and Ashtaroth of the past—under new names. And one of the most interesting of Professor Curtiss' discoveries is the frankness with which they are worshipped. Thus the guardian of the cave of Khidr—the Muhammadan equivalent of St. George—at the foot of Mount Carmel, said to him: 'Khidr is my god and my father's god!' and elsewhere he was told that St. George and God were brothers. It is to the shêkhs that vows are made and offerings brought, and good and evil are believed to be dispensed by them. They are often spoken of as interceding with God—an echo of that doctrine of intercession which played so large a part in the religion of Babylonia.

A third and important element in modern Canaanite (and Arabian) religion is the atoning character of blood. An important result of Professor Curtiss' investigations is to prove that the theory which traced the origin of sacrifice—at all events in Semitic lands—to a meal, is not only unsupported by the evidence, but contrary to it. The sacrifice consists, not in giving the divine powers a share in a feast, but in the 'shedding of blood' which is offered to the object of worship. Without the shedding of blood there is no sacrifice, and it is the blood alone which averts the divine anger and reconciles the offerer to his god. The flesh is not eaten, either actually or symbolically by the god, nor is the eating of it of a religious character. But the blood is 'life,' and in shedding

it a sign and proof are given that the life demanded by the deity has been yielded up. The deity has a right to everything, like the absolute master of a Semitic state, but he is willing to accept only a part and allow the life of a single victim to be substituted for what he might otherwise claim. Hence it is that the blood is smeared on the walls and entrance of a house, in token that the victim has been offered, and that the angel of destruction must therefore spare its occupants.

This belief in the atoning nature of blood goes back to the very roots of 'Semitic' religion. If Professor Curtiss' researches had produced no other result, the establishment of this fact alone would have amply rewarded them. But his book is full of new and stimulating data of all kinds, and breaks ground in what is in large measure a fresh field of investigation. The present is the child of the past, and if we would understand the past we must first learn what the present has to teach us.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

ACTS VII. 59, 60.

'And they stoned Stephen, calling upon the Lord, and saying, Lord Jesus, receive my spirit. And he kneeled down, and cried with a loud voice, Lord, lay not this sin to their charge. And when he had said this, he fell asleep' (R.V.).

EXPOSITION.

'And they stoned Stephen.'—Went on stoning, *i.e.* while he was praying.—COOK.

'Calling upon the Lord' (ἐπικαλούμενον).—Regular word for calling upon a *god* for aid. Translate 'calling upon (the Lord Jesus) and saying 'Lord Jesus . . .' The only accusative that can be grammatically supplied after ἐπικαλ. is τὸν Κύριον Ἰησοῦν.—PAGE.

STEPHEN meanwhile was *calling upon* the Lord whom he had seen to *receive his spirit*. To *call upon* means to invoke in prayer, but the A.V. had no ground for inserting *God*; the object of the prayer was the *Lord Jesus*.—RACKHAM.

'And saying, Lord Jesus, receive my spirit.'—The first martyr followed the example of his Lord (Lk 23⁴⁶). Kay has noted several instances of the language of Ps 31⁵ having been used by Christians at the approach of death—Polycarp, Basil, Bernard, Huss, Columbus, Luther, and Melancthon.—COOK.

'And he kneeled down.'—As Jesus Himself in the agony in Gethsemane (Lk 22⁴¹). The more usual Jewish posture in prayer was standing (*e.g.* the Pharisee and Publican, in Lk 18¹³). But kneeling seems to have been the attitude indicative of a special sense of dependence (*cf.* Mk 15¹⁹, 'Bowing their knees, worshipped him').—BARTLET.

'And cried with a loud voice, Lord, lay not this sin to their charge.'—When we contrast the dying prayer of the O.T. martyr, Zechariah, 'The Lord look upon it and require it,' we see that the Cross had done its work. Like Christ on the cross, Stephen prayed for them—literally, *Set not this sin to them*; where *set* means either (1) in the set

scales against them, or (2) set it down firm, unmovable to their account.—RACKHAM.

'And when he had said this, he fell asleep.'—The metaphor is common to all languages; but the word is used here in striking contrast with the scene just described. Note, too, the cadence of the word (ἐκοιμήθη), expressing rest and repose, and *cf.* the last word of the Acts, ἀκωλύτως.—PAGE.

THE calmness of death was depicted in Greek poetry under the figure of sleep. But assurance of a life to come imparted to that figure a deeper meaning on Christian lips, suggested in the first place by Christ Himself (Jn 11¹¹). Christian faith alone could apply such a term to the painful and violent death of the martyr.—RENDALL.

THE SERMON.

Witness of St. Stephen.

By Bishop Wordsworth, D.D., D.C.L.

It is a significant fact that in the Church of England Calendar the Festival of St. Stephen is held on the day after Christmas. This is intentional, because the death of St. Stephen can only be explained by the Birth of Christ, and because of the Death the Birth is glorified. There is a second reason, however, for the juxtaposition of these Festivals. Christmas is a time of joy, and the remembrance of the death of St. Stephen does not sadden the believer; it increases his joy. It reminds us that 'the birth of Christ is for the Christian the death of death.' In the words of St. John, 'Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth,' and Stephen 'died in the Lord because he had lived in the Lord'; in the words of the ancient maxim, *Qualis Vita, Talis Mors!* His death was remarkable chiefly for two

things, the unwavering faith and the unfailing charity which he showed, and these two he had practised in his life.

i. *His Faith*.—We are told that he was ‘a man full of faith and of the Holy Ghost.’ It was this faith which in his lifetime made his preaching irresistible, so that the gainsayers ‘were not able to resist the wisdom and the spirit by which he spake.’

ii. *His Charity*.—Surely it was on account of his charity, his regard for others, that he was chosen one of the seven deacons—on account of these qualities that he became the most prominent of all the deacons. He spent his life thinking of others, and thus when he died they still occupied his thoughts. The first lesson that we may draw from these verses is, that if we wish to have a holy and happy death, we must live a good and holy life. We may, however, learn a second lesson, namely, that one holy death may be expected to produce another. In the general sense, the death of Stephen has been an inspiration to all Christians; but also very probably it was St. Stephen’s martyrdom that brought about the conversion of St. Paul. It certainly prepared his mind.

Are we doing our utmost, striving with all our might, to live the life that Stephen lived, so that we may die the death that Stephen died? Are we becoming more and more fit to die day by day—

Senior et melior fis accidente senecta?

A Final Prayer to Jesus.

By the Rev. Charles Jerdan, LL.B.

i. When the first shower of stones fell upon Stephen, he prayed aloud to Jesus, in the words, ‘Lord Jesus, receive my spirit.’ They were almost the very words which Christ Himself used as He hung on the cross. And now that death had come to Stephen, he remembered vividly the death of the Master. ‘He took the Son of Man as his model; and he prayed to Him as the Son of God,’ and Stephen’s prayer was heard. ‘He fell asleep’ in Jesus.

ii. Fifteen hundred years later another martyr died, praying the same prayer as Stephen.

This time the martyr was Patrick Hamilton, the first Scotch Reformer. He had studied at the University of Wittenberg, and there he fell under the sway of Luther’s influence, and returned to Scotland fired with enthusiasm to lay the founda-

tion of the Scotch Reformation. So successful was he that the clergy became alarmed, and Archbishop Beaton summoned him to St. Andrews to answer the charges against him. A few days later he was burned at the stake as a heretic, and his dying prayer was, ‘Lord Jesus, receive my spirit.’

Stephen’s Three Crowns.

By the Rev. John C. Lambert, B.D.

Stephen comes from a Greek word, *στέφανος*, which means a crown. And this man, whose very name meant ‘a crown,’ had three crowns set upon his brow—first, the crown of grace; second, the crown of thorns; and, last, the crown of glory.

i. *The Crown of Grace*.—All through Stephen’s short life his grace or goodness was remarkable. Because of it he was chosen one of the seven deacons, and fulfilled his duties so well that after his election ‘the word of God increased, and the number of the disciples multiplied in Jerusalem exceedingly.’ In his speech to the judges, and more than all in his death, we see the grace of Stephen.

ii. *The Crown of Thorns*.—Stephen did not only wear his crown of thorns when he was dying, he also wore it in his lifetime. He was misunderstood. ‘There arose certain . . . disputing with Stephen.’ When he was dying, however, it pressed heaviest on him. His accusers, we are told, ‘gnashed on him with their teeth . . . and cast him out of the city and stoned him.’

iii. *Crown of Glory*.—After a crown of thorns borne patiently there must always come a crown of glory. Stephen had a foretaste of this glory when he looked up to heaven and ‘saw the glory of God, and Jesus standing at the right hand of God.’ He received it in all its fulness when he ‘fell asleep.’

ILLUSTRATIONS.

CHRISTINA ROSSETTI, in her book *Called to be Saints*, chooses the holly as representative of St. Stephen. ‘Prickles above,’ she says, ‘no prickles below.’ The title of scarlet oak has been borne by holly; but not, perhaps, with any striking appropriateness. Let us rather dwell on its familiar name of holly as derived from holy-tree; and thus, connecting it with all holy things, we note how its blossom shadows forth the hue of innocence, and its leaf the flourishing of hope, and its berry the colour of the blood which is the life; its eastward side is guarded by sharpness, as of self-denial; its heavenward aspect is smooth, as by peaceful contemplation; its leaf fades not, its blossom is comely, its fruit is the crown of its beauty.

Now come from that first century to this nineteenth century. Look there, just the other day, on the Quai Valmy, in Paris. There is a meeting being held in a little hall, a meeting to seek holiness from God; and about the door there is a multitude of raging Parisian roughs, the mad devil's brood, produced in the city by a century of atheism. At the door of the hall is a young Frenchman, Jean Monod, holding the door, trying to protect the women and the children who enter the hall from the unbridled violence of these wild beasts. As he stands there, he is suddenly stricken by one of the savages, and he falls, not to rise again.

Let us first come to his deathbed—the deathbed of this latest of those who have trodden in the footsteps of Stephen. He is very weak, he is just dying, but he speaks softly, and he says, 'Oh, heaven is beautiful! It is good to sing. Sing to me, "Thou art love, my God."' And the hymn is sung by his comrades who have filed silently into the chamber of death. Then with his hand in the hand of that brave young Englishwoman who has gone over to Paris to face the demons that atheism has raised—with his hand in her hand, and gently murmuring to himself, 'It is too beautiful! It is too beautiful!' he dies.

An unbeliever present, a godless Parisian, whom nothing hitherto had ever moved, was brought to God by the sight; brought down on his knees in penitence before the Christ for whom Monod was dying, he yielded his heart to the Saviour who died for him.—R. F. HORTON.

THERE was once a boy who was the eldest son of a well-known Scotch duke, and who lay dying of consumption. His minister came to see him, and the boy took his Bible from beneath his pillow and opened it at the words, 'I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith: henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give me at that day.' 'This,' he said, 'is all my comfort.' After that, as death drew nearer, he called his younger brother to his side and bade him farewell; and then he said, 'Now, Douglas, in a little while you will be a duke, but I shall be a king.'—JOHN C. LAMBERT.

FOREMOST and nearest to His throne
By perfect robes of triumph known,
And likest Him in look and tone,
The holy Stephen kneels,

With steadfast gaze, as when the sky
Flew open to his fainting eye,
Which, like a fading lamp, flash'd high,
Seeing what death conceals.

Well might you guess what vision bright
Was present to his raptured sight,
Even as reflected streams of light
Their solar source betray—
The glory which our God surrounds,
The Son of Man, th' atoning wounds—
He sees them all—and earth's dull bounds
Are melting fast away.

He sees them all—no other view
Could stamp the Saviour's likeness true,
Or with His love so deep imbue
Man's sullen heart and gross,
'Jesu, do Thou my soul receive:
Jesu, do Thou my foes forgive.'
He who would learn that prayer, must live
Under the holy Cross.—JOHN KEBLE.

FOR REFERENCE.

- Brooke (S.A.), Short Sermons, 141.
Calthrop (G.), Eden to Patmos, 269,
Jay (W.), Short Discourses, ii. 127.
Jerdan (C.), For the Lambs of the Flock, 404.
Lambert (C.), Three Fishing Boats, 91.
Liddon (H. P.), Sermons from the Penny Pulpit, ii.
M'Cheyne (R. M.), Additional Remains, 189.
M'Laren (A.), Creed and Conduct, 267.
Melvill (H.), Sermons (1856).
Moore (E.W.), Christ in Possession, 113, 124.
Pott (A.), Sermons for Festivals, 90.
Price (A. C.), Fifty Sermons, x. 273.
Schleiermacher (F. E.), Sermons, 385.
Symington (A. M.), Apostles of our Lord, 133.
Thorne (H.), Notable Sayings, 86.
Thompson, (H.), Concionalia, 16.
Tinling (J. F. B.), Facts and Similes.
Trench (R. C.), Sermons in Westminster Abbey, 80.
Vaughan (C. J.), Church of the First Days, 261.
Wordsworth (C.), Primary Witness, 1041.

Contributions and Comments.

Ῥακα!

ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι
πᾶς ὁ ὀργιζόμενος τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ ἔνοχος ἔσται τῇ κρίσει·
ὃς δ' ἂν ἐπὶ τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ ῥακά, ἔνοχος ἔσται τῷ συνε-
δρίῳ·
ὃς δ' ἂν ἐπὶ μωρῇ, ἔνοχος ἔσται εἰς τὴν γένναν τοῦ πυρός.—
Mt 5²².

ῬΑΚΑ is one of several Aramaic words which the Evangelists retain in their Greek versions of the

evangelic tradition, but it has this peculiarity, that it stands unexplained, without the customary formula, '*which is, being interpreted, —*.' Can it be that the Greek editor of Matthew's *logia* knew not what the word meant, and inserted it as he found it, merely transliterating it into Greek? If this be so, it is little wonder that our Translators should have adopted the same expedient. *Raka* is retained in the text, King James' Version offering

the marginal rendering 'vain fellow,' while the Revised Version has on its margin the comment, 'an expression of contempt.'

Even in the earliest days the word was a *crux interpretum*. It was generally connected with the Hebrew קר, 'empty' or, in a moral sense, 'worthless.' 'Hoc verbum,' says St. Jerome, 'proprie Hebræorum est. קר enim dicitur κενός, id est, inanis aut vacuus, quem nos possumus vulgata injuria absque cerebro nuncupare.' It would thus be a contumelious epithet, like 'empty pate!' Cf. ὁ ἄνθρωπε κενέ (Ja 2²⁰). Others, however, supposed that it was a Greek word and derived it from ῥάκος, a rag. 'Nonnulli de Græco trahere voluerunt interpretationem hujus vocis, putantes pannosum dici *Racha*, quoniam Græce pannus ῥάκος dicitur' (Aug. *De Serm. Dom. in Mont.* i. 23).

The word is certainly Aramaic, but it really matters little what language it belongs to and what it means. Whatever be its signification, it is simply a contumelious epithet, and the question is why Jesus should so sharply distinguish between ῥακά and μωρέ. Is it more heinous to style a man 'thou fool' than to term him 'an empty pate'? The truth is that *raka* was not an epithet at all, but an interjection. St. Augustine says he had this from 'a certain Hebrew' whom he questioned on the subject. 'He said it was a word which had no signification, but expressed the emotion of a disdainful mind' (*loc. cit.*). St. Chrysostom explains further that it was used in Syriac much like *you* in addressing a servant or a beggar: 'Begone, you!' 'Tell so and so, you!' τὸ δὲ ῥακά τοῦτο οὐ μεγάλης ἐστὶν ὕβρεως ῥῆμα ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον καταφρονήσεως καὶ ὀλιγωρίας τινὸς τοῦ λέγοντος· καθάπερ γὰρ ἡμεῖς ἡ οἰκέταις, ἡ τισὶ τῶν καταδεεστέρων ἐπιτάττοντες, λέγομεν· ἀπελθε σύ, εἰπὲ τῷ δεῖνι σύ· οὕτω καὶ οἱ τῇ Σύρων κεχρημένοι γλώττῃ ῥακά λέγουσιν, ἀντὶ τοῦ σύ τοῦτο τιθέντες (*In Mt. Hom.* xvi.). This use of σύ is a familiar classical idiom; e.g. Soph. *O.T.*, 532: οὗτος σύ, πῶς δεῦρ' ἦλθες; 'Sirrah! how camest thou here?' Cf. Lat. *Heus tu!*

When it is recognized that *raka* is not an epithet but an interjection of contempt, our Lord's meaning becomes clear. He has just assured His hearers that He has not come to pull down the ancient religion of Israel but to complete it, to fill in the outline and change shadow into substance; and by way of illustration He cites a series of familiar precepts, and shows the difference which He makes

and how, so far from setting them aside, He enlarges their scope and increases their content. The first is that commandment of the Decalogue: 'Thou shalt not kill.' According to the prevailing interpretation it took cognizance only of *acts*: He extends its scope, and comprehends within the sweep of its prohibition *thoughts* as well, not only the deed of violence but the disposition that prompts it. 'Everyone that hateth his brother,' said St. John afterwards (1 Jn 3¹⁵), 'is a murderer'; and this startling declaration is but a repetition of the doctrine of Jesus. Though he has not recorded it in his Gospel, St. John knew that doctrine. In terse and graphic language which would arrest His hearers and strike home to their consciences, Jesus depicts a double *crescendo* of sin and punishment. On the one side He sets an ascending scale of offences, each rising out of and including the last: Anger, Contempt, Abuse. 'In primo,' says St. Augustine (*De Serm. Dom. in Mont.* i. 24), 'unum est, id est, ira sola; in secundo duo, et ira et vox quæ iram significat; in tertio tria, et ira et vox quæ iram significat, et in voce ipsa certæ vituperationis expressio.' Over against these grades of sin stand their appropriate punishments: for Anger the Judgment, for Contempt the Sanhedrin, for Abuse the Gehenna of Fire.

The Judgment was the local court which sat in every provincial town and tried all offences committed within its jurisdiction (Schürer, *H.J.P.* ii. 1. 149-163). The Sanhedrin was the supreme court of the Jewish nation, which took cognizance of cases of blasphemy and which alone could pronounce sentence of stoning. And what was the Gehenna of Fire? Outside the southern wall of Jerusalem lay the Valley of Hinnom (גֵּהֵנָה גֵּי, Græcized γέεννα (*Orig. c. Cels.* vi. 25-26). Once a pleasant spot, it was profaned by the worship of Moloch, and at the reformation under Hezekiah it was defiled. Hither the refuse of the city was conveyed and the bodies of the vilest criminals were cast out, a prey for pariah dogs and carrion birds (Jer 7³¹⁻³³, 2 K 23¹⁰). It was choked with putrefaction and stench, and fires were kept burning to purify the poisoned atmosphere. In later days that horrid den, where the worm died not and the fire was not quenched (Mt 9⁴⁸, cf. Is 66²⁴), became a symbol of the place of doom. Here, however, it bears its literal and not its eschatological significance.

Such is the import of the Lord's language in

this striking passage. He that is angry with his brother is even as the culprit who is arraigned before the Judgment. He whose anger passes into contempt is as guilty as the blasphemer who is haled before the Sanhedrin. And he who adds abuse to contempt is on a level with those vile criminals whose bodies are cast forth into the loathsome pit of Gehenna. By such picturesque instances Jesus illustrates and enforces the general principle that the evil thought is as heinous as the evil act.

DAVID SMITH.

Tulliohan.

Quotation Marks in the New Testament.

THE University Presses of Cambridge and Oxford are famous for the correctness and beauty of their Bible editions. And yet even these Presses have not learnt to put the quotation mark in the right place when a sentence is quoted in a question. Compare Jn 10³⁴ with 12³⁸: 'Εγὼ εἶπα, θεοὶ ἐστε;' with 'Κύριε. . . τί νὺν ἀπεκαλύφθη;'. In the former case the order; is nonsense, and must be': in the second it is correct.

The same remark applies to editions in which the quotations are printed with different types. Then the mark of interrogation must belong in the former cases to the type of the text. But see, for instance, Allan Menzies, *The Earliest Gospel* (Macmillan, 1901; printed at the University Press, Glasgow), Mk 11¹⁷ 12^{11, 26}.

The only edition of the Greek Testament which I found correct on this point, is that of Westcott-Hort. Yet, so deeply rooted is this wrong custom, that when the publishers printed an edition of their own (Macmillan fount of Greek type, 1895), they introduced the old fault again. Not even Scrivener, in his reprint of Stephen, or the Clarendon Press, in the latest impressions of Lloyd's *Greek Testament*, were careful enough. See, for instance, in Lloyd's, He 1⁵ γεγέννηκά σε;', εἰς υἱόν; 1⁸ ποδῶν σου; 1¹

I hope the wide circulation of your pages will help to sweep away this bad practice for ever.

Maulbronn.

EB. NESTLE.

P.S.—In addition to this remark the notice may be of interest that in the third volume of the

¹ The passages of this kind are Mt 19^{5, 7} 21^{16, 42} 22^{22, 42, 44}, Mk 11¹⁷ 12^{11, 26}, Lk 20¹⁷, Jn 10³⁴ He 1^{5, 13} 3¹⁷ (Ja 2²¹).

Oxyrhynchus Papyri (Plate I.) a piece has just been published which contains the first example of quotation marks in Christian literature, perhaps the very first in all literature. The editors labelled it as Theological Fragments (405–406), 'probably the oldest Christian fragment yet published, interesting on account of a quotation from Mt 3^{16, 17}, which is indicated by wedge-shaped signs in the margin similar to those employed for filling up short lines.' Dean Robinson succeeded in showing that it is from the work of *Irenæus, Against all Heresies*, lost in Greek, but preserved in Latin; and it quite agrees with the careful character of that scholar that he should have used such marks. For Eusebius has preserved us the close of that work, in which Irenæus adjures the scribe who will transcribe it: 'by the day of Christ and His glorious coming, when He will come to judge the quick and the dead,' carefully to compare what he has written with the copy from which he has taken it, and to repeat this injunction too in his copy. Now, if so great a scholar like Irenæus was so careful in such small things, surely we may imitate him.

E. N.

X.M.F.

I HAVE just received the *Archæological Report of the Egypt Exploration Fund* for 1902–1903. There I read, p. 7, on the finds of Oxyrhynchus—

The Byzantine jars were often marked with the Christian symbol $\chi\mu\gamma$ found on inscriptions and in papyri, and explained either as an abbreviation of $\chi(\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\nu) \mu(\alpha\rho\iota\alpha) \gamma(\epsilon\nu\eta\grave{\epsilon})$ or as the sum of the numerical values of the letters in the words $\eta \alpha\rho\iota\alpha \tau\rho\iota\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \theta(\epsilon\omicron\varsigma)$, cf. our *Greek Papyri*, ii. p. 151. An instance in which $\chi\mu\gamma$ (the γ becoming a χ risim) was followed by $\varsigma\theta'$ (i.e. 99, the sum of the letters in $\delta\mu\eta\eta\eta$) perhaps supports the second explanation.

The *Greek Papyri*, ii. 151, which is here referred to, are at present not at my disposal; but allow me to mention a third explanation of these three letters X.M.F., which will at once recommend itself as soon as it is heard. The three letters are to be read $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$, $\mu\iota\chi\alpha\eta\lambda$, $\Gamma\alpha\beta\rho\iota\eta\lambda$, 'Christ with the two archangels.' The combination is found frequently in Syria, but recently it was met with even in Rome, stamped on tiles from the roof of Santa Maria Maggiore; see the *Nuovo Bulletino di Archeol. Cristiana*, 1896, and a short extract from it in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, ii. p. 305.

EB. NESTLE.

Maulbronn.

Tamar.

WE always turn with interest to Dr. Nestle's communications, our indebtedness to which it would be difficult to estimate. How often, for instance, he has rendered valuable service by citing from some ancient source an unfamiliar or hitherto unnoticed passage that has a bearing on the literary or historical criticism of Scripture. But, while welcoming his note on 'Tamar' in the December issue (p. 141), I must ask leave, as the writer of the article under that title in the *D.B.*, to say a few words in answer to his challenge of my right to call Tamar a Canaanite.

Perhaps, in dealing with a matter where absolute certainty is out of the question, it *might* have been better to say 'Canaanite (?)', with a query, but the whole context leaves no doubt in my mind that at least the author of Gn 38⁶ thought of Tamar as of Canaanite origin equally with Shua of v². We know that the historical tribe of Judah included numerous Canaanite elements, and in all probability the narrative of Gn 38 is a reminiscence of this. Moreover, when Tamar obeys Judah's command, and goes to her 'father's house' (v.¹¹), we learn from v.¹⁴ and v.²¹ that her home is at 'Enaim or 'Enam, a town in the Shephelah (Jos 15³⁴). I am glad to find myself in accord here not only with such commentators as Dillmann and Gunkel (the former of whom remarks that Tamar was 'doubtless' a Canaanite, the latter that she was so 'in any case'), but with Professor Cheyne (*Encyc. Bibl.* ii. col. 2618), although the latter adds the inevitable comment: 'Tamar as the name of a woman is most probably a corruption of some popular shortened form of *Jerahmēlith*.'

Of course Dr. Nestle will not seriously contend that *any* weight is to be attached to the statement of the *Book of Jubilees* (which is simply copied in the *Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs* and the *Opus Imperfectum in Matthæum*) that Tamar was 'of the daughters of Aram.' At the best, this (like pseudo-Jonathan's statement that she was a priest's daughter) can have been only pure conjecture, but it is more likely that it has an apologetic motive behind it. Judah was to be saved from the scandal of practically repeating in v.⁶ the act of v.², and a more reputable progenitor than the hated 'Canaan' had to be found for Tamar, the 'mother' of Judahite families, in the person of

'Aram,' the son of Shem (Gn 10²², P) and kinsman of Abraham (22²¹, J). J. A. SELBIE.

Maryculter, Aberdeen.

Cross-Bearing.

IN reply to a correspondent, Professor Massie of Oxford has stated, in *THE EXPOSITORY TIMES*, vol. xiii. p. 348, that Christ 'had in His mind, quite literally, the spectacle so often seen in those days, — a malefactor burdened with his own cross (or, more accurately, perhaps, the *patibulum*, the transverse beam of it) on the way to his own execution. And the lesson Christ intended to read to His disciples was one exactly suited to a time when confession of the Master might mean a cruel and degrading martyrdom.' The Rev. Joseph Palmer of Sydney replied to Professor Massie (vol. xiv. p. 288) in a note suggesting that the word *σταυρός* 'in ordinary use denoted merely a beam or log of wood,' and asking whether it might not be that 'when our Lord announced that to be His disciple it was incumbent on a man to take up his cross and follow Him, He meant, and was understood to mean, simply that whoever would be one of His people must accept and bear the load allotted to him of duty and care, and, if need be, suffering?'

This note is on the lines of Mr. Palmer's suggestion, but proposes a more definite interpretation of *σταυρός* than merely log or beam. The carrying-pole is known all over the East; its use is very ancient; it is represented on the Egyptian monuments. A common sight in Palestine, much more common than the malefactor burdened with the *patibulum*, may have been the slave or labourer, with his well-balanced load slung over his shoulders by means of this carrying-pole, following his master or his employer; and it would supply a picturesque and cogent figure of speech to our Lord when He desired to impress on His disciples the necessity of justifying their discipleship by a daily shouldering of the burden of duty and service. The only question is whether *σταυρός* is a word that could have been used to describe the instrument above named. The correspondence in *THE EXPOSITORY TIMES* leads me to believe that it could. At any rate, the suggestion is, I think, worth considering.

GEORGE M. REITH.

Edinburgh.

Was Saul a Hashish-Eater?

YOUR notes on Dr. Creighton's theory of Saul's insanity suggest a few remarks.

The passage in 1 S 14 is, in several respects, curious. The people came to a wood or thicket of some sort where there was 'honey' on the ground. 'Behold, a dropping of honey.' Jonathan dipped his staff in the 'thicket of honey.' When he had eaten, his eyes were 'enlightened.'

Honey does not seem a desirable dainty for hot and thirsty men. The word רֶבֶשׂ is vague enough. It is said to be used for grape-syrup, or must (Gn 43¹¹), and seems to mean any soft, sticky substance. Where there was such profusion of honey, if honey it was, bees would not be awanting. They would be specially active in the heat, and would sally forth ferociously against the intruders; yet Jonathan and some of the people linger to discuss Saul's oath and are not disturbed. The irresponsible tone of Jonathan's remarks is worth noting.

עֵרֶה, 'wood' or 'thicket,' might well apply to *Cannabis sativa*, which reaches a height of from 8 to 10 ft.

Jonathan's eyes were 'enlightened,' i.e. made bright, the pupils dilated, an effect of Cannabis, certainly not of honey. The resin of which he seems to have partaken, is known as *charas*. The leaves and small stalks (*bhang*), the female flowers (*ganja*), and the seeds, all are intoxicating. The eating or smoking of preparations of hemp is a very ancient practice mentioned as common in the fifth century B.C. It is after smoking *bhang* that the Malay 'runs amok' on the impulse of homicidal mania.

A medical friend, who once experimented on himself, says that Cannabis produces brain intoxication without affecting the limbs. Pleasurable sensations are greatly heightened; the street lamps seem like an illumination. The subject becomes hilarious and very voluble.

Does this account for the scorn of the proverb, 'Is Saul also among the prophets?' When, on their first interview, he told Saul that he should prophesy at a given place, did Samuel know of a growth of hemp in the neighbourhood? Did he, knowing Saul's weakness, hope that he would be a pliable instrument because of that weakness? Samuel certainly hated to think of the inevitable passing away of the theocracy, and it is probable that he hoped to find in the new ruler a docile

pupil. That Saul did so much—implanted in a congeries of isolated, jealous tribes the sense of nationality, curbed the arrogance of the priestly caste, made real the worship of one God, and prepared the way for a central shrine—is the highest tribute to his powers, a tribute all the greater if we see that he pursued these aims with a mind steadily failing by reason of vicious indulgence.

J. A. STOKES LITTLE.

Fraserburgh.

The Shortest Verse in the Bible.

I DO not remember exactly whether I heard it with my own ears in any English church or chapel, when I had the privilege of staying in England more than twenty years ago, or whether I read it somewhere at that time, a preacher began, 'My text is the shortest verse in the Bible'; and then he delivered a sermon on the two words, Jn 11³⁵ 'Jesus wept.' But is this really the shortest verse in the Bible? In the English Bible probably it is. But it is not so in the original languages. In the Hebrew Old Testament several of the ten commandments form verses which consist of two words or six letters only; and even in the Greek Testament, as it is read to-day, for instance by Westcott-Hort, there is a verse shorter than ἐδάκρυσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς. Which is it? Lk 20⁸⁰ καὶ ὁ δεύτερος.

EB. NESTLE.

Maulbronn.

Short Study of St. John iii. 2-5.

HAS Nicodemus been justly treated and his motives properly understood? It has been almost universally assumed that no weight may be attached to the words with which he opens the conversation, and that our Lord not only ignores them, but passes to a totally different train of thought.

A fresh study may show that, so far from this being the case, Nicodemus had a real hold of Christ's mission, that Christ grants at once that Nicodemus had perceived the Kingdom of God at work in Him, and that therefore Nicodemus was born *ἄνωθεν*, but that his refusal of John's baptism

prevented him from entering the Kingdom. Christ taught him that it is one thing to perceive the Kingdom, quite another to enter it; one thing to be born *ἄνωθεν*, another to be born of water and the Spirit, which is necessary to enter it and become a member.

Our survey need cover only the four verses 2-5. Identity of words used implies identity of ideas, therefore we must compare the statements of Nicodemus and the replies of Jesus.

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1. In v. ² Nicodemus says | <i>οἶδαμεν.</i> |
| In v. ³ Jesus | <i>ἰδεῖν</i> , inf. of <i>οἶδα</i> . |
| 2. In v. ² N. | <i>οὐδεὶς δύναται.</i> |
| In v. ³ J. | <i>οὐ δύναται.</i> |
| 3. In v. ² N. | <i>ἐὰν μὴ.</i> |
| In v. ³ J. | <i>ἐὰν μὴ.</i> |
| 4. In v. ² N. | <i>ἀπὸ Θεοῦ.</i> |
| In v. ³ J. | <i>τοῦ Θεοῦ.</i> |
| 5. In v. ⁴ N. | <i>εἰσελθεῖν.</i> |
| In v. ⁵ J. | <i>εἰσελθεῖν.</i> |

It will thus be seen that our Lord expressing His thoughts uses the same emphatic words as Nicodemus did; and when, as in v.⁴, a new idea is expressed by Nicodemus' *εἰσελθεῖν*, Christ adopts it for His purpose. Remembering all these identities of words, we are able to see that Nicodemus had a much higher conception of Jesus than he is generally credited with. Nicodemus says, 'We perceive that Thou art a God-sent Teacher, for no man can do the signs that Thou doest, except God be with him.' Compare this with St. Peter's description of Christ to Cornelius in Ac 10³⁸, 'Jesus of Nazareth anointed with the Holy Ghost, who went about doing good, etc., for God was with Him.' Nicodemus states that he knows 'Jesus was God-sent, a worker of signs, and that God was with Him'; and St. Peter describes Him as Jesus anointed with the Holy Ghost, a worker of signs, and that God was with Him. Could there be a closer parallel in description than between these two, Nicodemus speaking to Jesus Himself, and St. Peter, with full knowledge of His divinity, describing Him to Cornelius? Will, however, the *οἶδαμεν*, 'we know,' bear such a construction, and especially the plural,—will it not vitiate such precise knowledge?

Three cases in this Gospel will show that it can bear such force. At v.¹¹ of this same chapter our Lord, using the plural, says to Nicodemus: *ὁ οἶδαμεν λαλοῦμεν*, 'we speak what we know'; again, chap. 4²², He says: We worship *ὁ οἶδαμεν*, 'what we

know'; and once more, as emphatically as possible, *γὼν οἶδαμεν ὅτι οἶδας πάντα*, 'We are sure (A.V.) Thou knowest all.'

After such clear examples we need not be afraid to say that *οἶδαμεν* will bear a precise definite meaning of certain knowledge, and that Nicodemus did apprehend Jesus as from God for establishing the Kingdom of God. Christ's reply confirms this. It is tantamount to saying, 'Verily, if a man were not born *ἄνωθεν*, he could not perceive the Kingdom of God, as you do, Nicodemus. If you perceive Me as God-sent, and that God is with Me, it can only be because you have been born *ἄνωθεν*.' The reply of Nicodemus seems positively to imply gross ignorance, seeing that the phrase, 'born *ἄνωθεν*,' was current at the time, but passing that by, let us fasten attention on the word used by him, which our Lord uses in His reply. Nicodemus asks, 'Can he (*εἰσελθεῖν*) enter a second time.' Our Lord replies by saying, 'A man cannot (*εἰσελθεῖν*) enter the Kingdom of God except He be born of water and of the Spirit.' Nicodemus may have been one of those who refused baptism at the hands of John; perhaps he was an Essene, and, like the Quakers, wholly absorbed by the spiritual idea of God's Kingdom, and unwilling to have anything visible or earthly (carnal ordinance, as St. Paul says) connected with it. At any rate, our Lord has taught him that his perception of Himself shows he has grasped the meaning of God's Kingdom, and that therefore he was born *ἄνωθεν*; as He said to Peter, 'Flesh and blood hath not revealed it to thee, but My Father which is in Heaven.' Nicodemus, though he had perceived the King and the Kingdom, had not yet entered it, for to enter a man must not only be born of the Spirit, but also of water. The Spiritual King uses visible means: 'You must be born of water and of the Spirit.'

Except a man be born of the Spirit he cannot see.

Except a man be born of water and Spirit he cannot enter.

CHARLES WATSON.

Newcastle, Co, Down.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, St. Cyrus, Montrose.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

PROFESSOR DRIVER has written a new Commentary on the Book of Genesis. It is published by Messrs. Methuen in the series of 'Westminster Commentaries' edited by Dr. Walter Lock. It is an English commentary, and it is characteristically English. The type is large and the margins ample. Into the same space a German publisher would have crammed four or five times the material. But the English way is the best way. Like all Dr. Driver's work, this Commentary supersedes everything on Genesis that has gone before it.

It is a generous book. The previous editors of Genesis are appreciated. In this also it differs from some German literature. And all that has been written touching Genesis, however obscure the writer or the organ of publication, seems to be known and appreciated. The generosity is the more marked and valuable that no pity is allowed to cover the culpability of work which is unscholarly or misleading.

At the very beginning of his Commentary Dr. Driver has to consider the antiquity of man upon the earth. The subject is one of intense interest. But it is not for the interest of it that Dr. Driver discusses it, but for its bearing on the interpretation of Genesis. Perhaps some of its interest arises from its bearing upon the interpretation of

Genesis. For it is well known that archæologists have recently been assigning a far greater antiquity to man than the Book of Genesis seems to know of. And it is felt that on that point alone may turn the question whether we can attribute to the Old Testament a literal historical value throughout.

What do the archæologists say about it? Dr. Driver first quotes Professor R. W. Rogers—'a most cautious and guarded American Assyriologist'—on Assyria. 'If we call up before us,' says Professor Rogers, 'the land of Babylonia, and transport ourselves backward until we reach the period of more than 4000 years before Christ, we shall be able to discern here and there signs of life, society, and government in certain cities. Civilization has already reached a high point, the arts of life are well advanced, and men are able to write down their thoughts and deeds in intelligible language and in permanent form. All these presuppose a long period of development running back through millenniums of unrecorded time.'

The Egyptologists agree. Dr. Budge assigns the date of Menes to 4400 B.C., Professor Flinders Petrie to 4777 B.C. Now Menes' tomb was unearthed in 1897, and the objects of art it contained show that already the civilization of Egypt was far advanced. More than that, the researches of Petrie, Amélineau, and de Morgan have brought

to light the remains of a race that preceded the dynasty of Menes, a race probably of Libyan origin, which differed from that hitherto known as the Egyptian race both in physical character and in civilization. They worked in flint, and shaped it into weapons, tools, and implements of all kinds. These flint implements of theirs belong to the Neolithic age, an age which Sir John Evans concludes came to an end in Egypt about 5000 years before Christ. The perfection of workmanship of the flaked and fluted flint knives would seem to indicate that this age must have begun in Egypt long before.

The evidence of language and of race carries us still farther back. We possess inscriptions much older than the date of the Confusion of Tongues, written in three entirely distinct languages, Sumerian, Babylonian, and Egyptian. One of these languages, the Babylonian, already has the form it exhibits 3000 years later. That is to say, it already shows signs of 'advanced phonetic degeneration,' and differs from Hebrew, Aramaic, and other Semitic languages almost exactly as it does in its best known period. For this point Dr. Driver refers to Professor M'Curdy's article on the RELIGION OF THE SEMITES in the forthcoming Extra Volume of the *Dictionary of the Bible*. How far back then must we go before we reach the time when the common ancestors of *all* the Semitic peoples lived together and spoke a common language? And if we must go far back for that, how much farther back must we go to find the ancestors of the Semites and the Aryans living together and using the same language?

Professor Driver proceeds. He gathers the evidence of Ethnology and of Geology. Ethnology asks how long it took the Egyptian and the Negro to differ, as they do on the Egyptian monuments 4000 years ago. The Negro and the Bushman have been living for a long time under the very same conditions of sun and rain, and they have not approached one another or varied from their proper type an appreciable quantity. Geology says

that the relics of human workmanship found in the Pleistocene period, along with the remains of extinct mammals, carry the men who could carve and draw back beyond the present time—well, upon the most moderate estimate, at least 20,000 years.

What are we to do with the Biblical Chronology? What a mercy it is that the date of the Creation, 4004 B.C., is found in the margin and not in the text of our Bibles. What are we to do? Get a Bible without a margin. But that will not serve us. For Archbishop Ussher, who was so foolish as to place that date in the margin, did the best that scholarship could do in his day. And even yet it cannot be denied that his calculations are correct. It is the Bible itself that is at fault, if there is a fault. And Professor Driver has no hesitation in coming to the conclusion that 'the writers to whom we owe the first eleven chapters of Genesis, *report faithfully what was currently believed among the Hebrews* respecting the early history of mankind, at the same time making their narratives the vehicle of many moral and spiritual lessons, yet there was much which they *did not know, and could not take cognizance of*: these chapters, consequently, we are obliged to conclude, incomparable as they are in other respects, contain no account of the *real* beginnings either of the earth itself, or of man and human civilization upon it.'

There is a remarkable article in the *American Journal of Theology* for January on the 'Religious Situation in France.' The writer's name is withheld at his request. The article is signed A. G. B.

The article is remarkable for its frank condemnation of the present Government, its frank condemnation of the party most strongly opposed to the Government, and its frank use of the names of the men who are prominent in the struggle.

There are three parties in France. There is first the agnostic, militant, anti-religious party. Its

leaders are François de Pressensé, deputy from Lyons; Lintilhac, deputy from the Cantal; G. A. Hubbard, deputy from Paris; Dantresme, general secretary of the Prefecture of Bouches du Rhône; Charbonnel and Guineaudau, formerly Roman Catholic priests. Its chief newspapers are *La Raison*, *L'Action*, and *La petite République*. Its aim is the extinction of Religion in every shape and form. 'It is necessary,' said M. Dantresme, in his chairman's address at the distribution of prizes at the Lycée of Marseilles, on the 31st of July, 'it is necessary to draw all superstitious prejudices out of the mind of the younger generations. We want a system of education cleared from that Christian humility which lowers man by the be-setting thought of sin, and renders him a quaking and credulous slave. The future will be ruled, not by faith, but by science, which makes the conscience free. If the evolution of the human mind proceeds without religion, so much the better.'

Accordingly, F. de Pressensé has drafted a Bill to do away with all religion. It begins with dis-establishing the four churches that at present enjoy the advantages of establishment in France—the Roman Catholic, Presbyterian, Lutheran, and Jewish Churches. And then it proceeds to pursue them with civil disabilities in no fewer than eighteen particulars. And when, with the help of the present Government, it has accomplished the utter extinction of religion, this party will proceed to make arrangement for its restoration! There are to be certain free-thinking ceremonies which will take the place of the sacraments and services of the Christian Church—there is to be an initiation of children corresponding to Baptism or Confirmation, and there is to be an occasional 'Feast of Reason' to take the place of the Eucharist.

The agnostic party is all for freedom of conscience and of action—in theory. In practice it has proved its sincerity in this way. On the 11th of June the customary Fête-Dieu was to have taken place in Paris, but *La Raison* and *L'Action* cried

out against it as an obstruction to the streets, and the Government prohibited it. On the 2nd of August they themselves organized a grand procession of agnostics, and marched past the statue of Étienne Dolet, the Government sending a strong body of police to see that they were not molested.

In direct opposition to the anti-religious party is the Ultramontane Catholic party. Its enemies are in power at present, and it is actually suffering much persecution. But give it power again and this writer believes its ways will be as arbitrary and as unjust as those of the party now in the ascendant. For its professed object is to subordinate all secular institutions to the Church, and subject all other denominations to the control of the Roman authority. But the best proof of its identity in spirit with the agnostic party is its attitude towards the anti-Semitic movement in Algeria, and the Dreyfus case at home.

There is a third party. This writer calls it the Liberal party. It adopts a middle way. Its way is not a mediating way, however. It is as keenly opposed to both the agnostics and the ultramontanes as they are opposed to one another; and it secures the equal dislike of both. Its aim is to give every religion and every man equal rights in the land. Its newspapers are *Les Débats*, *Le Temps*, *Le Figaro*, and *Le Siècle*; and it is strongly supported by the *Revue des deux Mondes*. Its leaders are of every shade of religion or of none—Roman Catholics like Georges Picot, Ribot, and Anatole Leroy Beaulieu; Protestants like Gabriel Monod and A. Lods; agnostics like De Lanessan and Waldeck-Rousseau; and even Jews like Henri Michel and Théodore Reinach. The time is at hand, our anonymous author believes, when the Liberal party will be in a majority in the Government.

Who is Dr. Paul Carus? We can answer that. He is the editor of *The Monist*, a quarterly

magazine 'devoted to the Philosophy of Science,' and of *The Open Court*, an illustrated monthly magazine, 'devoted to the Science of Religion, the Religion of Science, and the Extension of the Religious Parliament Idea'; and he is managing director and inspirer of the Open Court Publishing Company of Chicago. But Dr. Paul Carus is also a theological philosopher. Where does he stand? That question is not so easy to answer.

There is an answer in the *Princeton Theological Review* for January. It is the work of Dr. H. C. Minton, and it is in the form of a review of two volumes published by Dr. Carus in 1903. The volumes are *Fundamental Problems*, or the Method of Philosophy as a Systematic Arrangement of Knowledge, and *The Surd of Metaphysics*, an Inquiry into the question, Are there Things-in-Themselves? Dr. Minton knows the other books which Dr. Paul Carus has published. They are voluminous, but they are 'either an explication or an application' of the philosophical principles set forth in these two volumes. These two volumes give a satisfactory account of Dr. Carus' philosophy. Here, says Dr. Minton, we have in a nutshell the Philosophy of the Open Court.

Now the Philosophy of the Open Court is worth some attention. Dr. Paul Carus 'is a man of no merely amateur accomplishments in the arena of dialectical thought and discussion. He has convictions of his own, and he is not wanting in courage or ability to enforce them. He disclaims originality, or, more accurately, he affirms his endeavour to avoid it. In this, whatever his own modesty may lead him to declare, it will hardly be unjust to charge him with some measure of failure. It may be more surprising to the savants of the opening century, that a new and somewhat original philosophy should come out of the utilitarian and mammon-worshipping city of Chicago than it was to them of the old time that any good thing should come out of Nazareth; but in both instances the thing which surprises is the thing which comes to pass.'

The philosophy of Dr. Paul Carus goes by the name of Monism. He has chosen this title himself. He knows that it is not a new title. He knows that Spinoza chose it before him. He knows also that there is the risk of confusion between his Monism and that of Spinoza, for they are not the same. Yet he has chosen the name of Monism. For he believes that his philosophy, and his alone is entitled to that name. Spinoza's doctrine is a pseudo-Monism. It is merely Henism, and by that name it ought to be called.

Spinoza held the doctrine of one substance in the universe. That, says Dr. Paul Carus is Henism. Dr. Carus is Hegelian enough to recognize two substances. But he rises above Hegelianism as he rises above Spinozism. He affirms that neither spirit nor matter has existence. Both are forms of abstract thought. Both are lost in that higher unity which only has being, that Cosmos or Existence which in the most absolute sense is all and in all.

There are no differences of kind in this All-Existence. There is no natural and supernatural. There is no Creator and created. There is no Divine and human. All is Nature, and all Nature is alive. Haeckel says that all Nature has intelligence, has a soul to see: that is merely panpsychism. Dr. Carus says far more than that. All Nature is alive, he says, or at least it has the capacity to live. This part of his philosophy he calls 'panbiotism.' There may be organic life and inorganic life. It may be that the former was developed out of the latter. But life is an inherent fundamental property of matter. 'Christ's words are literally true, when he says, God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham.'

It was not Christ, it was John the Baptist, who used these words. But we may let that pass.

The philosophy of the Open Court is a positive philosophy. But again its positivism is not the positivism of Auguste Comte. It is positive in

the simple and primitive sense that it is based on positive fact. There is no proper intuition or *à priori* in it. All is science, all is of experience, all rests on the proved continuity of Nature. It is true that nature has not yet been universally ransacked and every appearance brought within the scope of law and order. But enough has been done to guess the rest. The unity of Nature is accepted in the philosophy of Monism as a scientifically proved and universally established fact. It is the telescope of the French philosopher sweeping a wider heaven and finding no God. Dr. Paul Carus comes back with his telescope, his microscope, and every instrument that science has ever invented, and he says 'One.' There is no matter and there is no spirit; there is cosmos alone, the great All-One.

Dr. Minton asks the question, Is this new Occidental Philosophy pagan or Christian? He need not ask it. Dr. Paul Carus plainly declares he is no Christian. He accepts the ethics of Christ. The Cosmos cannot give him better ethics or more workable. But the ethics of Christ, he says, are not the ethics of Christianity. Christ did not, Christianity does, disregard the order of the universe and the findings of science. Now 'the surrender of science is the way to perdition.' And, however reluctantly, Dr. Carus is obliged to break with Christianity out and out, for there is no supernatural and there is no God. 'By God,' he says, 'we understand the order of the world that makes harmony, evolution, aspiration, and morality possible.' It is not that he denies the personality of God. God is a person and more. He is all that a person is, and he is more than a person can ever be. He is the All-in-all. He is spirit and matter combined, and not merely combined, but lost in a higher reality. He is Cosmos. We may call the All-One God if we like. But to speak of the Cosmos as God is to use the language of poetry. We may compare it to a father and with Christ call it 'Our Father,' but we only mean what we mean when we speak of Mother Nature. And as there is no God, there is of course no worship. 'We

do not call the "All" God in order to bow down into the dust and adore it. We regard adoration as a pagan custom, which, it is a pity, survived into Christianity.'

We have not yet got all its meaning out of the Transfiguration. We have not yet got much out of it. And what are we? The Church of Christ has not yet got much out of it. The Rev. A. T. Fryer, making one more effort in the *Journal of Theological Studies* for January to get something out of the Transfiguration, points out that it has very little place 'in the consciousness and liturgical system of the Church.'

One thing has always been seen in the Transfiguration. It has always been seen that Moses represented the Law and Elijah the Prophets. Mr. Fryer begins with that. He thinks, however, that it would be nearer the purpose if we said that Moses represented the priesthood. He was the founder of the Aaronic priesthood, he consecrated the first high priest of that order, and Aaron was simply appointed to be his mouth-power or word. Mr. Fryer does not deny the force of finding in Moses the representative of the Law, of which Christ's 'exodus' was to be the fulfilment and passing. But if Moses is also, and chiefly, recognized as the representative of the priesthood, then he thinks the presence of Moses and Elijah at the Transfiguration is fruitful of meaning to Christ Himself, to the disciples, and to us.

For there is no other occasion but this on which Christ was consecrated to be our Prophet and our Priest. Such consecration was necessary. On Calvary He would accomplish the act which would prove Him a priest forever and make us priests in Him, the act which would prove Him a prophet forever and make us prophets in Him. And so they spoke of His decease which He should accomplish at Jerusalem. But He has to be set apart for that act, and this was the occasion of His ordination. Moses was present to see the meaning

of that glorious vesture in which he had arrayed his mouthpiece, and the meaning of all that bloodshedding of countless lambs. Elijah was there to see the reality of which his own prophetic activity had been a shadow, the beginning of that school of prophets which should outnumber his largest dream. The disciples were there that they might hear of His exodus, in which the priestly and prophetic offices would be accomplished, and understand that the ignominious manner of their accomplishment took nothing from their grandeur and eternal power. And Christ Himself was there, the centre of the ceremony, the Priest who is to be also the Victim, the Prophet who in His Sacrifice is to reveal to men the will of God.

There are many things to see in the Transfiguration: this is what Mr. Fryer would have us see. He does not forget the Kingly office of Christ, but that comes after. First He is made a Priest and a Prophet. By the presence of Moses and Elijah He receives all that the priest and the prophet have been in the past; by the presence of the disciples He passes on the priesthood and the prophecy to the future. The disciples representing the future have their share in His consecration, as well as Moses and Elijah who represent the past. For He is consecrated, not by outward ceremony, but by the acceptance of the Father's will. The word of consecration is 'This is My beloved Son.' And the acceptance of the Father's will is Calvary, in which lay all the hopes of the priests and prophets of the past, all the assurance of the priests and the prophets that are yet to come.

The disciples, we say, had to be there as well as Moses and Elijah. For as Moses was a true

priest and Elijah a true prophet, so they are to be true prophets and priests unto God. And it is not without its purpose that three disciples were taken with Him into the Mount, while only two saints descended from heaven upon it. The two stood for the priestly and the prophetic offices, the one for the one, the other for the other. But henceforth the priestly and the prophetic are to be combined in one Person, Jesus Christ, and in every one of His followers in Him. Three is the number of representation. Peter is to receive the double office, and so are James and John. And three mean thirty times three, even the whole number of the followers of the Lamb.

When did the followers of our Lord receive the office of priest and the office of prophet? At the Resurrection the one; at Pentecost the other. When the veil of the temple was rent in twain the way of access was open to all. And when the tongues of fire sat on the head of each of the followers of Christ who were assembled together on the day of Pentecost, they received the gift of prophecy.

Now the important thing is that the way was made open for *all* into the Holiest, and that the tongue of fire sat upon the head of *each of them*. It was the business of the priest in the preparatory dispensation to present the people's prayers to God; it was the business of the prophet to take back His answer. Now every follower is to be a priest and a prophet. Every follower is to present his own desires and receive an answer for himself. 'Enviest thou for my sake,' said Moses at the tabernacle in the wilderness; 'would God that all the Lord's people were prophets.' He came down upon the Mount of the Transfiguration to see his desire fulfilled.

The Retrospective Love of God.

BY THE REV. FRANCIS BARTLETT PROCTOR, M.A., VICAR OF WARTHILL, YORK.

I ne'er forsooth could have believed it true
That Death had slain such myriads of mankind.

DANTE: *Inferno* iii. 56.¹

PERHAPS the great outstanding word of the Gospel is that of Jn 3¹⁶—the golden text of the Bible—'God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have eternal life'; and its counterpart in the First Epistle, which tells us that 'God is love,' and adding, 'Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that He loved us, and sent His Son to be the propitiation for our sins,' 'and not for ours only,' it is previously stated, 'but also for the whole world.' There is a similar all-embracing and comprehensive word of the Lord Jesus, recorded by the same evangelist, 'I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto me.' Now the 'world,' of the Gospel, the 'whole world' of the Epistle, and the 'all men' of the Great Magnetizer, indicate something that we think has undergone great obscurity since the apostle wrote; and the endeavour in this paper will be simply to draw attention to this obscurement.

The great facts that stand revealed in the passages quoted are perfectly obvious: ours is a lost world, peopled with innumerable souls, all exposed to the peril of 'perishing.' The compassionate love of God seeks to avert that peril; and His love was manifested in this, that He sent His only begotten Son to be a propitiation for the world's sin. And to guard against any sectarian possibility of limiting the scope of the divine compassion, it is expressly stated that it was adequate for the evil, coextensive with the whole need. We have these facts to fall back on when we preach the gospel; and the preacher ought surely to be very watchful over any limitations he may be tempted to impose on his message. The door of God's mercy is set wide open, and it is not for us to half-shut it, and talk about 'gates ajar,' when we go forth with our commission in His name, to do our share of preaching the gospel to 'every creature.'

When the peril the world was in had got to its worst; when the wisdom of this world failed to

find a remedy, and despaired of its desperate condition, then God 'in the fulness of time' sent His son. He showed what love could do: for 'where sin abounded grace superabounded.' And now the question is this: Seeing that the love of God in Christ was manifested very late in the history of the world, what are we to understand by 'the world' for which Christ died? Are we to limit it to the world since Christ, or does it comprehend that other larger half of the perishing world, who knew not the promises, who did not see what we see, nor hear what we are privileged to hear, who lived and sinned, and died without God, without Christ, without hope? In other words: Is the 'world' that St. John speaks of, the world B.C. as well as A.D.? Is the love of God meant to be retrospective as well as prospective? For it may be taken without saying that the conception that many good Christian people have of the world for which Christ died is the world of Christian times only—our world—an *αἰὼν* not *κόσμος*—without giving a moment's reflexion to the needs, and to the far more perilous condition of those who lived before there was any gospel that could be preached to them. In the latter case, are we not in danger of limiting the love of God to a smaller world than that for which His compassionate love had to find a remedy? or of making the kingdom of Christ a 'little kingdom,' as some of our countrymen are sometimes spoken of as 'little Englanders'? Does not the apostle preclude our falling into this mistake—may we say, of a narrow selfishness—when he of set purpose uses language calculated only to express the widest possible scope of the all-embracing love of God in Christ—a propitiation for our sin, and not for ours only, but for the 'WHOLE world?' The 'whole world' cannot be less than the whole (*κόσμος*); it cannot be a part or a section of the whole; it cannot be the Jewish as opposed to the Gentile world; it cannot be the world A.D. (*αἰὼν*) as opposed to the world B.C. Another apostle sets no bounds to the saving love of God, its 'length, breadth, depth, and height passeth knowledge'; its riches are 'unsearchable,' 'past finding out.' Everything that is said of it is calculated to make us pause before we

¹ Bohn's translation.

attempt ever so guardedly to set limits to the love of God in Christ for the world.

The history of opinion on this matter shows that for the first two or three Christian centuries the 'love of God' was interpreted in a retrospective as well as a present and prospective sense; and that it was the great Augustine who first thought scorn of that wider view, and did what he could to limit Catholic teaching on this subject. Notwithstanding the commanding authority of the great Western Doctor, there was a world to be saved before Christ, and 'Jesus seeks the lost, and the lost are to be sought also in the kingdom of the dead.'¹ Augustine's teaching imposed serious limitations and conditions inconsistent with the freeness and fulness of 'the gospel of the grace of God.' . . . 'The "coming salvation" must have had a retrospective effect upon those of bygone ages. The redemptive work of Christ looked back on the past as well as forward to the future.'² It is quite obvious that we of A.D. times and privileges are not 'the whole world' for which Christ died. The vast kingdom of the dead B.C. undoubtedly contained many of Christ's sheep; and the kingdom of the nether-world awaited its coming King. The claims upon our consideration of that larger half and kingdom of our fellow-men—with its human needs, its crying sins, with its darkness, its unalleviated hopelessness and despair—are, we think, imperative. We may believe that it stands altogether outside the redemptive work of Christ; and this may account for the slight amount of attention that has been given to the subject. But for one moment let us try and realize as well as we can something of the magnitude of that world of humankind which had passed away before Christ came.

The kingdom of the dead B.C. was a vast kingdom. It contained the souls of all the dead who had lived and died from the Creation to Christ—we have no fixed data for that long period. There were those of the antediluvian world—from Adam to Noah; there were those who perished in the judgment of the Flood. Following them were the Hittite and the other great nations and kingdoms of antiquity, that followed in successive generations, with their large cities and huge populations, too numerous for mention. All we need to

grasp is the fact that they did exist, and formed an aggregate of human souls—lost, or capable of redemption—which no man can number. The catalogue of their sins is black, yet not blacker than the sins of modern nations and cities under the ameliorating influences of Christianity. The learned and brilliant Bishop of Worcester remarks on St. Paul's enumeration of the sins of the Gentiles: 'Nor is there a word which St. Paul says in this chapter which would not be true of our modern civilization in London, Paris, or New York . . . we look around on the life of our city, with its selfish and disgusting lusts, with its drunkenness, with its enervating luxury, with its selfish and dishonest commerce, with its grasping avarice so neglectful of the lives of those whom it makes its instruments.'³ As we read this we ask, Is London, or Paris, or New York to have its leaven of Churches dotted thickly all over the place, and its Salvation Army of evangelists ceaselessly at work among the masses, whilst the sinners of ancient Babylon and Egypt, and all the innumerable dead who lived aforetime would have no equivalent 'benefit of clergy' and of Christ? May we not hear Abraham pleading, as once he did, 'That be far from Thee.'

But what we are now concerned with is not so much the sinfulness, as the number of these ancient peoples, who stood in need of a Saviour before there was a Christ, and to ask whether or not the natural inference of Holy Scripture allows us to embrace all these as of 'the whole world' which Christ came to redeem. The barest reference to statistics, even the most superficial and imperfect, will serve to convince us that the world B.C. is indeed 'the majority.' We have no means of estimating what the population of that world was, except by a comparison with modern data. In 1882 the population of the earth was roughly estimated at 1,433,887,500.⁴ This, counting three generations in a century, when multiplied by nineteen centuries, would with all deductions make a total 'which no man could number' of souls which had come and gone in A.D. times. But our A.D. era is short in comparison with the B.C. millennia reaching far back—how far we know not, since Archbishop Ussher's '4004' has been ruled out of court—to the Creation; for evolution counts not by years, but by ages. We

¹ Dörner, *Christian Doctrine*, iv. p. 409. Clark's 'F. and T. Library.'

² J. Stuart Russell, *The Parousia*, p. 301.

³ Bishop Gore on Ro 1²⁰.

⁴ *Encyclopædia Britannica*.

can, however, form an estimate sufficient for our purpose to show that the population of the Old World—from Adam to Christ—amounted to a total of appalling magnitude. These, with few exceptions, must have lived and died in ignorance of God and salvation, utterly without hope. Few of them had any sense of sin—‘For sin is not reckoned where there is no law’—we are, of course, excluding Israel.

Here, then, we have a world of unknown magnitude, of uncertain millennia, a kingdom of the dead, in which myriads of Adam’s children were exposed to the same peril of ‘perishing’ unless a saving hand was extended to them as to us. Is it inconceivable that all these were of the ‘whole world’ which Christ came to save? For us to deny this would be to place ourselves in very objectionable company: *e.g.* Strauss remarked on the judgment of the Flood, ‘That the fact of vast masses of men, before Christ, dying without being brought into relationship to Christ, proves that the Christian revelation, because not universal, is not necessary to salvation.’ But before this can be urged as a valid argument against the Christian revelation, it will be necessary to strengthen it with an additional premise, namely, that there was for them no such possible experience as coming into relation with Christ in the kingdom of the Dead. It is just here that the New Testament Scriptures are decisive: ‘For to this end,’ it is expressly stated, ‘Christ both died and revived that He might be Lord both of the dead and the living.’ ‘Here, says Bishop Gore, St. Paul touches upon the descent into Hades, and indicates the purpose of it. For this end Christ died, that He might be the Lord of the dead. It might have been imagined that the dim realms of the dead were outside the jurisdiction of Christ—that the dead have no king—that the kingdom of redemption does not include them. To obviate such an opinion, to show the universality of His realm, Christ went down among the dead.’¹ And these dead were the B.C. dead. This would seem to be conclusive.

On 1 Pet 3¹⁰ and 4⁶, in which the above sceptical argument is completely overthrown, Dr. Chase says: ‘The two passages taken together appear unquestionably to assert that at the supreme crisis of redemption the Redeemer Himself proclaimed the gospel to the dead, those who perished

in the Flood being particularly specified, and that therefore such blessings of the gospel as are not confined to this earthly order were offered to them.’²

O, the generations old, o’er whom no church-bell tolled,
Christless, lifting up blind eyes to the silence of the
skies—

For the innumerable dead is my soul disquieted.

Still Thy love, O Christ arisen, yearns to reach all souls
in prison;

Down beneath the shame and loss sinks the plummet
of Thy Cross;

Never yet abyss was found deeper than Thy Cross could
sound.

Moreover, have we any right to pass judgment after our own standards and privileges on these bruised and broken reeds of a former dispensation? This is, at least, a case of the ‘many stripes and few stripes.’ We need not assume that all these numberless ones were cast away because God could get no music out of them, and the end of existence was utterly unattainable. It may have been so, but we do not know, for instance, that the antediluvians were finally dealt with and judged in the overwhelming calamity of the Flood. Who knows what repentances, what calling upon God, what laying hold of the skirts of His mercy there may have been at the last awful moment—in *articulo mortis*—when escape was impossible? What, too, about the multitudes of children who could not discern between their right hand and their left, all involved in the like calamity? Can we think that that was their last judgment? Browning has finely said—

He fixed thee mid the dance

Of plastic circumstance,

This Present thou forsooth wouldst fain arrest;

Machinery just meant

To give thy soul its bent;

Try thee, and turn thee forth *sufficiently* impressed.³

Here the poet teaches something of the great issues that hang upon opportunity and environment. And if these, of whom we speak, realized the lack of finality in their brief span of life, and felt the insatiable hunger that, as Augustine teaches, every created soul feels after its Creator, would not that be a ‘sufficient impress,’ and qualify for the glad reception of Him, in whom ‘all fulness dwells,’ when ultimately He should present Himself to them? This much, at least, we can all readily

² *The Dictionary of the Bible*, s.v. 1 PETER.

³ Rabbi Ben-Ezra.

¹ Bishop Gore on Ro 14⁹.

admit: 'This world is a place where God slowly tunes His instruments which shall hereafter send forth the sweetest music: Men stupidly take God's tuning of the instruments for the concert itself; and then they exclaim, that it is a very poor thing, and a great failure.'¹

The question as to the localization of these numberless dead asked in the solemn question, 'A man dies and where is he?' cannot be discussed now. They are somewhere in the universe of God—in some Sheol, Hades, or Gehenna, as is variously stated in the Old and New Testament Scriptures. Now, however, we are mainly anxious to ascertain 'what saith the Scripture' about the dead who passed into that unseen world before Christ came? We again emphasize the statement 'Before Christ,' because with the Coming of Christ, and the setting up of His kingdom, the Old World came to an end—it went out in catastrophe in the year 70 A.D. That, too, was the judgment of the Old World, the winding-up of its affairs; and the Beginning of the New World (*αἰὼν*), 'Behold,' said the Saviour-King, 'I make all things new.' And, as has been well said, 'Christianity is the absolutely teleological religion, pointing to a definite decision in the future in reference to individuals and the whole. In the Old Testament Christianity is the essential contents of eschatology. One might think that after Christianity appeared prophecy is at an end, everything is fulfilled. *And this was the expectation both of the prophets and the apostles*, namely, that the End, the consummation of the world, will come with the Messiah. Nay, that the Messiah will, first of all, execute judgment, and that the revealing of His power will be the first thing.'²

What then follows as to those myriads of the dead before that final act? We learn from Scripture that these lead a shadowy existence in an under-world, distinct from the grave. In passages too numerous to mention, this fact is ever insisted on: the dead are gathered to their fathers, and live a ghostly life somewhere, which was contemplated as 'loss' and not gain; and for this reason even the godly, as in the case of Hezekiah, dreaded it. More modern notions have favoured the idea that the uncovenanted and uncircumcised dead are annihilated; others hold to the notion of a universal restoration of the whole human race. But the

Old Testament knows nothing of either theory. When a man dies his body is given back to the earth, and his spirit returns to the God who gave it. Existence after death is never in doubt, but is always understood as a matter of course. Except in the case of the covenanted nation they knew nothing of the promises, nothing of the hope of Israel, and had but the dimmest expectation of a coming Messiah—the 'desire of all nations' was instinctive.

The question we are endeavouring to answer is, What was the fate of these dead B.C.—these 'Christless, lifting up blind eyes'? Did the 'whole world'—the *κόσμος*, as the totality of all men living in the world³—which Christ came to save, include them? Are we not permitted to believe that the compassionate love of God was both retrospective and prospective? was for the *κόσμος*, not for an *αἰὼν*? In other words, that the 'quick and the dead' of A.D. times have no advantages in which the B.C. dead did not participate. If so, then it follows that the dead of the Old World—from Adam to Christ—would not be judged until in some way they had been brought into relation to Christ, and could have an opportunity of accepting or rejecting Him.

The inference that we draw from Holy Scripture is that the world of the dead B.C. were not judged, but were awaiting judgment—kept waiting all that long time until their Judge should be appointed: as St. Paul speaks of a day, near at hand, when the dead should be judged by Jesus Christ 'according to my gospel.'⁴ Seeing that every human soul survives, it may be that 'no soul reaches the crucial point of its probation'⁵ till it has come into contact with Christ. The knowledge of Jesus Christ is, perhaps, the condition of final judgment for every soul. He who does not believe in the Son has not life; but not to believe implies a position to decide for or against Christ, and this cannot be applied to all.

It is here that we should recall the Saviour's declaration, 'If I had not come and spoken unto them, they had not had sin; but now they have no cloak for their sin.'⁶ . . . St. Paul, on the dissipation of agnosticism, standing in the very centre and capital of pagan idolatry, surveys the past, 'God suffered all nations to walk in their own ways,' and not only so, but He withheld direct revelation from the majority, abandoning them to the light of nature. Then he adds the remarkable words which ought to form a portion of almost

¹ Crawford—successor of F. D. Maurice.

² Dörner's *Christian Doctrine*, iv. p. 376.

³ Trench, *Synonyms*.

⁵ Godet.

⁴ Ro 2¹⁶.

⁶ Jn 15²².

every sermon, 'But the times of this ignorance God winked at—R.V., overlooked; *i.e.* clearly in the sense of not bringing the world into final judgment solely on the basis of their ignorant heathenism—overlooking their offence, and failing to punish them.' . . . 'If the ignorant millions who had died in heathenism were to be consigned to hell—as Xavier taught the Japanese that they would be—it could not have been said that God had hidden His eyes from, or overlooked, or winked at, or passed by their ignorance.'¹ In view of this, the belief sometimes held, that the dead B.C. were outside the scheme of salvation, cannot possibly be entertained. God is represented in the Old Testament as dealing tenderly and mercifully with ignorant sinners. He teaches Jonah a lesson of compassion towards the ignorant multitudes in Nineveh, 'Should not I spare Nineveh, that great city, wherein are sixty thousand persons that cannot discern between their right hand and their left?'² Is it inconceivable that, as to-day the Church is sending missionaries to heathen countries, so God has found means of sending missionaries to these ignorant heathen of the past? What did F. D. Maurice mean on his deathbed, when told that his earthly ministry was over, by replying, 'If I may not preach here, I may preach in other worlds,' unless he believed that there was mission work to be done among the dead?

God's name and character, His infinite pity and compassion, are all on the side of mercy; and are all opposed to the accepted view; and are all, we think, strong arguments for believing that the dead B.C. would have, in some way or other, the benefits of Christ's Atonement brought home to them equally with ourselves. The inference of the Scriptures all tends that way. And if Moses and Aaron were punished for their failure in honouring God's infinite patience and compassion towards stiffnecked sinners, do we not need to take heed

lest we, too, sin in like manner; or break the Third Commandment (as is done by many teachers) by taking God's Name—'His new best name of Love'—in vain, when we represent Him as falling short of all that His name implies,³ or as failing to act up to His character? There is surely room for pause here. The poet Heine, who died jesting, is said to have 'kept his most wonderful *mot* for the last: "*Dieu me pardonnera*," he said, "*C'est son métier*.'" 'Was there ever a more wicked speech uttered,' asks the late Dean Farrar, 'than that of Napoleon the First, when Prince Metternich told him that his plan would cost the lives of a hundred thousand men; and he haughtily replied, "A hundred thousand men! What are a hundred thousand men to me?" Metternich walked to the window and flung it open, exclaiming with indignation, "Sire, let all Europe hear that atrocious sentiment." As we read, we are tempted to ask whether some good people do not worship a God like that?

The present Bishop of Chester, Dr. F. Jayne, is responsible for the following story, which will make a suitable pendant to what has been here said: A Welsh colliers' Bible class had chosen the Epistle to the Romans for their subject of study and discussion, and before tackling the doctrine of Predestination in the eighth and ninth chapters,—'On whom He will He hath mercy, and whom He will He hardeneth,'—one of the class said, by way of caution, 'Mind, boys, whichever way you take it, keep the character of God clean.' Whole shelves of theology, adds the Bishop, could not furnish a more golden maxim. And this, too, is a needed caution for us as we try to pierce the gloom hanging over the fate of those myriads who died, not in faith, B.C. We whose business it is to make mention of the Lord, must keep 'the character of God clean,' and free our minds of prejudice.

¹ E. White on Ac 17^{14, 16}.

² Jonah 4¹¹.

³ Ex 34^{6, 7}.

‘Things as They Are.’¹

BY THE REV. ALEX. TOMORV, M.A., DUFF COLLEGE, CALCUTTA.

THIS is probably the most vivid word-picture of mission work in India ever written. Books on missions are often dull and ponderous. But every one of the thirty-two chapters of this book is clear cut as a cameo, and positively throbbing with sensation. The author is obviously a highly qualified observer, gifted to a rare degree with a photographic power of depicting actual scenes so as to make them live, and a gruesome faculty of disclosing the horrible in its hideous nakedness. The result is a book that, whether we like it or not, we are bound to read to the finish, and that will drive its pictures deep into the mind and memory. The style is crisp and bright; the thoughts of the writer are burningly stated; her attitude and her convictions thrill through every chapter. In one chapter (xx.) she excels herself in her description of child life in South India, and lets herself go in humorous pictorial word-painting that delights the reader with the almost idyllic presentment of children as they are.

But the author is not an artist in perspective. She selects episodes, describes them so that they live before our eyes, and leaves us with the impression that there is nothing else in mission work than the kind of scene she depicts so graphically. In chapter xxxi. she explains her point of view. She is a missionary doing pioneer work among women in outlying villages in the Tinnevely district of Southern India. She felt it to be her duty to go where there were no other mission workers, and to break new ground. This desire is laudable and intelligible, but it gives a misleading picture of mission work in the Madras Presidency or in India generally to-day. Nor is the first preaching of the gospel to such ignorant and superstitious and degraded people as she depicts likely to bear much fruit in any conditions, let alone in Indian villages, where the new white *mem* would first be regarded probably with fear as a ghost or demon, and on closer acquaintance with pity as an escaped lunatic. What one who knows and

loves India misses in the book is any sign of true perception by the author of the domestic virtues of the Hindus, of the Scotch-like self-sacrifice of mothers for the education of promising sons at school and college, of the un murmuring self-effacement of many Hindu men for the benefit of other members of their family, of the noble reverence for aged and sickly relatives, of the love strong as death that animates their domestic life. The absence of such admissions vitiates the picture as a study in perspective.

Each episode is doubtless true; the narrative bears the marks of vivid eye-witnessing; but there are too many peeps into hell, and too few allusions to the homely virtues of Hindu folk. The author is an intense lady who has attained to a very high degree of self-surrender to the will of God, and of obedience to the call to a missionary life of self-sacrifice. Her very exalted standard may well shame average Christians, but it operates cruelly and unfairly when applied to the poor women she depicts as sunk in benighted ignorance and sinful superstition.

Things are bad enough in India to-day without any one-sided presentations. The dislocation that has taken place between the mind and the conscience of young India is producing a pathetic sickness of soul. The mind is approximating to the European standard, while the conscience is of Asia, Asiatic; and that means from the shores of the Bosphorus to those of the Pacific comparative indifference to immorality, un veracity, and cruelty, coupled with a singularly inflammable fanaticism on all matters affecting religion and nationalism. The young Hindu of to-day is in a very tight place, and wise missionaries will have ‘long patience’ with him, until perhaps after many days he will find in Christ the solution of all problems, and the incentive to the highest life. India is coming to Christ more rapidly than Hindu advocates like, as is shown by recent utterances of anti-Christian leaders in India on the results of the census of 1901. If the men with all their opportunities for culture and enlightenment are so circumstanced, how can the women, who are admittedly far behind the men in enlightenment be expected to be receptive

¹ *Things as They Are: Mission Work in South India.* By Amy Wilson-Carmichael, Keswick Missionary, C.F.Z.M. London: Morgan & Scott. Pp. 303, and 39 illustrations.

of the first message of the gospel as Miss Wilson-Carmichael gave it to them?

The author's heart rightly burns with indignation at the cruelty perpetrated in child-marriage on girls who become mothers almost before they have attained maidenhood. She could not write too strongly of the evils attending the custom, or of the indifference of enlightened Hindu men who permit it, or of the crass fanaticism of Hindu women who have gone through its sufferings themselves and yet do not end the cursed tyranny. If ever one nation had the right to interfere in the cruel customs of another, Britain has the right to interfere in this matter in India, and it is to be hoped that the reading of this book will stir many a British mother's blood and lead her to agitate till the evil is removed. How difficult it will be to get reform secured is indicated on p. 228, where the author refers to the Age of Consent Act, which raised the age of consummation of marriage for girls to *twelve* years, and yet the law is known to be a dead letter; for the police surveillance of Hindu Zenanas, without which breaches of the law cannot be discovered or proved, is simply impracticable in the present conditions of Hindu society. Till the women of India rise against the abomination themselves there is little hope of legislation producing any useful result. God speed the day when this shall be!

The author returns again and again to three topics that she thinks want representing to the British heart: (1) caste; (2) girl-devotees of Hindu temples; (3) violence to would-be converts to make them renounce Christianity.

1. In her view caste is the greatest foe of Christianity in India. So malignant is its operation that she regards it as the masterpiece of Satan. There is a much simpler explanation. The Hindu regards caste as almost a divine institution, though it belongs to later Hinduism, and can be shown to have been a social classification in the first instance. But whatever its origin, it stands to the Hindu to-day for purity of blood, for clanship, for comradeship, for patriotic enthusiasm, for nationalism, for trades-union-like co-operation, as well as for God's verdict on religious and moral character in a previous life. The Hindu grips on to caste with a tenacity that is the resultant of three forces: tradition, intensive selection in marriage, and selfish retention of privilege.

Caste is the most characteristic feature of the

Hindu of to-day. However widely the Hindus of one province may differ from those of another in mental and moral qualities or in economic conditions, they are equally inflammable on the subject of caste, with a sensitiveness and a fury that make Europeans gasp. Caste knows no richer classes and poorer classes, literate and illiterate. All caste-fellows are brothers; others are outsiders. There are many secondary applications of caste, but probably only one primary application. In enlightened centres, such as Calcutta, men of different castes may, and do, eat together, smoke the same hookah, sit on the same benches at school and college, or in the tramway car or in the railway carriage. In these particulars a rigid interpretation of caste rules has been modified. But in the primary relation, in marriage, there is no relaxation. No self-respecting Hindu can marry out of his caste or sub-caste. If he does he forfeits respect and loses his status. It is difficult for a simple straightforward European to understand why some things break caste and others do not. Believing in Christ, reading the Bible, praying to God, attending Christian services, learning from missionaries—these do not affect caste, but baptism breaks caste. Is it impossible to hope for such a modification of caste as will allow Hindu heads of families to regard baptized members of their families as not necessarily out-casted? Even advanced Hindu thinkers shake their heads at this suggestion; but in view of the numerous modifications of caste that have taken place in a generation, nothing is impossible. Such a relaxation would undoubtedly remove the greatest obstacle to the acceptance of Christianity by men who are theologically Christians but sociologically Hindus.

The author is right in her analysis. Every Hindu rejection of Christ turns upon caste. Still there seems little utility in denouncing it, but great promise of success in working for its modification from within, as the result of the knowledge and the progress that are rapidly changing the leading centres of India into outposts of Western civilization.

2. In the chapter headed 'Married to the God,' and throughout the book, the author refers to the degraded girls and women attached to temples in South India and associated with worship. Their relations with priests and others are undeniably immoral. This immorality is part of Hindu

worship in South India. In some other provinces, if it is done, it is done surreptitiously, so that it is not an obvious scandal that can be exposed. But there is no doubt of its openess in South India. There is no doubt also that the more thoughtful Hindus deplore the obscenity and the scandal. But it is a far cry from a Hindu's deploring a scandal to his taking any action to remove it. Agitation must begin in this Christian land and pass to the minds of Indian leaders before any such reform will take place. May this book help to bring about this healthy change! It would not be difficult for police authorities to suppress the open and shameless vice that goes on in temples in Southern India, but they would only drive it under the surface. In the meantime the immorality should be made known and denounced till the priests are forced into cleansing the Augean stables.

3. The author refers in several places to instances in which Hindu parents are said to have killed their children by poison, or to have driven them mad with drugs, in order to prevent them from becoming Christians. Such cases are reported all over India, and no Hindu parent expresses abhorrence or even astonishment at the occurrence. He regards the caste law as so sacred that he feels

justified, like the judges of the Spanish Inquisition, in destroying his son's body for the good of his soul. Still it would be murder if it were detected. But the police can be bribed, a death certificate can be bought from a doctor, the superintendent of the cremation ground asks no questions, and the cremated ashes tell no tales.

It is difficult to see how such skilfully elaborated methods of removing recalcitrant converts can be effectively exposed by the only persons who care enough, namely, the missionaries. Besides, life in India is terribly cheap at best, and in comparison with caste honour its value is infinitesimal.

This book teaches the needed lesson that Hinduism is not dead as a tradition and a social force, and does not hesitate on occasion to have recourse to violence to prevent its honour from being sullied. If only the fanaticism of the caste could be converted into loyalty to Jesus Christ, what a modern miracle the world would see! Hindus exhibit a solidarity and a devotion when their religion is touched, that not only shames Christians, but gives a promise of good things to come when they shall accept Christ as Lord, and their collectivism and piety shall become forces on the side of the kingdom of God, instead of sullenly antagonizing its advance, as they do now.

Recent Foreign Theology.

A SURVEY.

BY THE REV. J. A. SELBIE, D.D., MARYCULTER, ABERDEEN.

The Babel-Bibel Controversy.

THE issue of this controversy, which is now drawing to a close, has been in every way satisfactory. Professor Friedrich Delitzsch, without intending it, has helped to set the unique character of the religion of Israel in a clearer light than ever, while labouring to prove that religion to be simply a (sometimes degenerate) descendant of the system of beliefs that prevailed in ancient Babylon. In Germany there has been, as a matter of course, a great deal of well-meant, but mistaken and misinformed, zeal displayed against the famous two lectures and their author. Such attacks may be ignored. But there have been damaging criticisms from the side both of Assyriology and

Old Testament Theology, criticisms which, we have no hesitation in saying, have shattered entirely the main contentions of Delitzsch. From time to time we have noticed the more important of these contributions to the controversy. Since our last reference to the subject, we have received four publications, all of value and all fitted to exercise a sobering effect upon those who are either inclined to follow blindly the lead of Delitzsch, or disposed to reject *in toto* the idea of any Babylonian influences being at work in the development of the religion of Israel.

The first two of these works are Zimmer's *Keilinschriften und Bibel nach ihrem religionsgeschichtlichen Zusammenhang* (Berlin: Reuther & Reichard, 1903; price M.1) and Bezold's *Die*

babylonisch-assyrischen Keilschriften und ihre Bedeutung für das Alte Testament (Tübingen and Leipzig: J. C. B. Mohr; London: Williams & Norgate, 1903; price M.1.50). The position of Zimmern, whose name is a guarantee alike for scholarship and caution, will be sufficiently familiar, in view of previous references to him in these pages. Bezold's brochure has a value independent of its bearing on the Babel-Bibel question. It will be found to be one of the best possible popular introductions to Assyriology, a purpose which it serves all the better, owing to the numerous illustrations it contains.

Professor Budde, who has already rendered excellent service to the cause of truth in this controversy, has published a popular lecture which ought to have the same reassuring effect on the Christian mind in our own country as we have no doubt it has exercised in Germany. The lessons of the controversy are set forth by Budde in the brochure entitled *Was soll die Gemeinde aus dem Streit um Babel und Bibel lernen?* (Tübingen and Leipzig: J. C. B. Mohr; London: Williams & Norgate; price. 9d. net). Finally, we have a reply to Delitzsch by one whose name is very familiar to our readers, Professor F. Hommel of Munich. In addition to matters of general interest, there are special points where Professor Hommel takes Delitzsch to task. Not the least important of the discussions contained in this pamphlet (*Die altorientalischen Denkmäler und das Alte Testament*, Deutsche Orient Mission, Berlin, 1903; price M.1.50) is that on the name 'Jahweh,' a subject on which the last word has not yet been said.

All the four works we have named deserve careful study. In addition to these, we must refer to two historical reviews of the Babel-Bibel controversy, one by an eminent Old Testament theologian, the other by an equally eminent Assyriologist. Both, it is needless to say, find abundant occasion to disagree with Delitzsch. Professor W. Nowack of Strassburg, in the *Theol. Rundschau* (October–November 1903), and Professor P. Jensen of Marburg, in the *Literarisches Centralblatt* (12th December 1903), both take full account of everything of importance that has been published either by Delitzsch himself or any of the other participants in the discussion. Anyone who has mastered these two reviews will have a very good idea of the position of affairs. A useful summary account of the controversy is given also

by Dr. J. Boehmer in the *Studierstube* for November 1903.¹

Archæology.

CLOSELY connected with the Babel-Bibel controversy is the voluminous literature called forth by the recently discovered Code of Hammurabi, which, as was mentioned by the Editor last month, will form the subject of an exhaustive article by Mr. Johns in the forthcoming Extra Volume of the *Dictionary of the Bible*. The Code, which has been the object of minute investigation by scholars of all nationalities, is fully and competently handled by Dr. Francesco Mari in his recently published work, *Il Codice di Hammurabi e la Bibbia* (Rome: Desclée, 1903), which contains an historical and critical introduction and an Italian version of the Code *in extenso*.

The German edition of Professor M. Jastrow's great work, *Die Religion Babyloniens und Assyriens*, makes steady progress. We believe six parts (although we have only as yet received five) of the projected ten have already appeared. The fourth part, which lies before us, concludes the account of the Assyrian pantheon, which is followed by chapters on the triad and the invocation of groups of deities, and on the Neo-Babylonian period. Then comes the all-important subject of the Religious Literature of Babylonia, the first subdivision of which (the Incantation Texts) carries us beyond the end of the fourth part, and fills the whole of the fifth, without being completed even then. Our readers will be gratified to learn that the publisher (J. Ricker, Giessen) sees his way to carrying out the project of issuing a supplementary portfolio of illustrations, which will greatly enhance the value of the work.

The fascinating story of the rediscovery of Nineveh is told once more in the pages of *Der alte Orient*, by so competent a narrator as Dr. Rudolf Zehnpufund. This admirable series (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs; price of each issue 60 pfennigs) has always maintained the highest character; and we

¹ Since the above was in type, we have received an admirable work by Dr. Boehmer, entitled *Babel-Bibel Katechismus* (Stuttgart: Greiner & Pfeiffer; price M.2), of which we hope to speak more fully on a subsequent occasion.

can heartily recommend 'Die Wiederentdeckung Nineves' to the attention of our readers.

The *Sitzungsberichte der Kais. Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien* (Philosophisch-Historische Klasse), Band cxlvii, contains a paper by Dr. Alois Musil, entitled 'Sieben Samaritanische Inschriften aus Damaskus.' These seven inscriptions in the Samaritan character were found on stones in the wall of an old house at Damascus, and are at present in the possession of a Turkish surgeon there. Information regarding them, accompanied by copies of the inscriptions, was sent to Dr. Musil by A. Xanthopoulos, the vice-consul for Austria, who imagined that the stones might have originally belonged to the Gerizim temple. That, of course, is out of the question; they are much more likely, as Dr. Musil suggests, to have formed part of a Samaritan house of prayer at Damascus. Meanwhile, pending further investigations, Dr. Musil has published facsimiles of the inscriptions, with transliteration into Hebrew letters, and a German translation.

Exegesis.

WITH gratifying promptness the second volume of Dr. C. A. Bugge's great work on the Parables of our Lord has made its appearance, thus completing what will be henceforward one of the most valuable possessions of the New Testament student. All that we had the pleasure of saying in our full notice last September (p. 549f.) regarding the first volume applies to the second, which deals in detail with the later Parables of the Kingdom in Matthew and the Individual Parables in Luke. The two volumes, which are not purchasable separately, cost eleven shillings (Giesen: J. Ricker, 1903).

A work that has been eagerly awaited by O.T. scholars, Baentsch's commentary on *Numbers*, has now appeared (*Numeri übersetzt und erklärt; und Einleitung zu Exodus-Leviticus-Numeri*; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht; Glasgow: F. Bauermeister, 1903; price 6s.). With this issue the great series of Old Testament commentaries known as 'Nowack's *Handkommentar*' is complete. It will be observed that the present volume includes the Introduction, not only to *Numbers*, but to the Books of *Exodus* and *Leviticus*, the

commentaries on which, also by Baentsch, were published three years ago. Students of the Old Testament are fortunate in having now at their command (and they ought to have them all) three first-class commentaries on *Numbers*—the present work, the commentary by Holzinger (in the 'Kurzer Hdcom.' series), and that by G. Buchanan Gray (in the 'International Critical' series).

The Introduction discusses first the title of the books, *Exodus*, *Leviticus*, and *Numbers*, and then passes to the Contents, which are grouped under three main divisions, which are appropriately subdivided—

I. The work of deliverance: Ex 2¹–15²¹.

II. Israel in the wilderness: Ex 15²²–Nu 20¹⁸ (embracing the period from the 15th of the 1st month after the Exodus to the 1st month of the 40th year).

A. From the Red Sea to Sinai: Ex 15²²–18.

B. Israel at Sinai. The covenant and legislation (from the 3rd month after the Exodus to the 20th day of the 2nd month of the 2nd year): Ex 19–Nu 10¹⁰.

C. Israel's journeyings from Sinai to the frontiers of Edom (from the 20th day of the 2nd month of the 2nd year after the Exodus to the 1st month of the 40th (?) year): Nu 10¹¹–20¹⁸.

III. From Kadesh to the Plains of Moab. The first conquests and settlements in the territory east of Jordan (from the 1st month of the 40th year after the Exodus to the 1st day of the 11th month of the same year): Nu 20¹⁴–36¹.

A. From Kadesh till the commencement of the march to the Plains of Moab: Nu 20¹⁴–22¹.

B. Israel in the Plains of Moab: Nu 22²–36.

This is followed by a careful characterizing of the narratives of J, E, and P respectively, whose various contributions are distinguished in detail. In dealing with the Book of the Covenant our author of course takes account of the Code of Hammurabi and of the literature called forth by its discovery. A special section is devoted to the poetical passages occurring in the three books in question. The Song in Ex 15 is held to be

not earlier than the Deuteronomic period. The Balaam oracles are not so late as von Gall and others would make them, although they may have undergone repeated revision and received pretty recent additions. The final redaction of the middle books of the Pentateuch is described in the way with which we are now familiar. The section dealing with the historical value of the traditions embodied in these books deserves special notice. It is needless to add that the commentary proper is all that we should have expected of its author and of the series to which it belongs.

In the same series we are glad to notice the issue of a second edition of Nowack's own admirable commentary on the Minor Prophets (*Die kleinen Propheten*; same publishers as above; price 8s.). Notice is taken of all important criticisms of the first edition, and the author finds it necessary on two occasions (pp. 97, 160 f.) to take Wellhausen somewhat sharply to task for the tone of some remarks of his.

Theology.

DR. BUGGE, whose work on the Parables is noticed above, contributed to the *Z.N.T.W.* for May 1903 an article entitled 'Das Gesetz und Christus nach der Anschauung der ältesten Christengemeinde.' That article has been followed up by the author's *Das Gesetz und Christus im Evangelium: zur Revision der kirklichen Lehre 'de lege et evangelio'* (Christiania: Jacob Dybwad, 1903). The problem the writer sets himself is attacked with much ingenuity, and the book is a most suggestive one, whatever judgment may be formed regarding the solution proposed. We must content ourselves with indicating very generally Dr. Bugge's standpoint. He sets out with the fact that, in the time of Christ, the *Torah* was the sum and centre of religion at least in Pharisaic circles—the circles that gave the tone to Jewish thought. The *Torah*, in fact, held the same place there as *Christ* did in the early Christian communities. The *Torah* was invested with attributes of pre-existence and the like, was hypostatized in short. It thus becomes a natural step to identify the *Torah* and the Messiah. The latter, indeed, comes to be regarded as an incarnation of the former. This holds good especially of the system of St. Paul. Our readers must go for themselves to Dr. Bugge's work to learn what he has to say

about the two methods, the *via reductionis* and the *via evolutionis*, whereby Jesus is explained in terms of the *Torah*, or the *Torah* by Jesus, respectively.

Pfarrer Johannes Herzog has written a short work on Conversion, in which an interesting attempt is made to obtain a psychology and a clear view of that phenomenon, from the data supplied by Scripture and in the history of the Church. The book deserves careful study (*Der Begriff der Bekehrung, im Lichte der heiligen Schrift, der Kirchengeschichte und der Forderungen des heutigen Lebens*; Giessen: J. Ricker, 1903; price M.2).

Miscellaneous.

DR. J. HEHN of Würzburg has published a study entitled *Sünde und Erlösung nach Biblischer und Babylonischer Anschauung* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1903; price M.1.60), which makes a sincere attempt to do justice alike to Scripture and to Babylon. The resemblances, sometimes startlingly close, between the Biblical and the Babylonian conceptions of sin and of redemption are drawn out in detail, but the differences are not overlooked. In particular, the author lays emphasis (p. 62) on the circumstance that the Babylonian notion of sin is *naturalistic*, and its method of redemption *magical*, whereas the Bible lays stress on the need of *moral* renewal, and traces Christ's victory over evil to His self-sacrifice, His love to God and man, and His voluntary death.

A book belonging to something of the same category is H. Gunkel's *Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Verständnis des Neuen Testaments* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht; Glasgow: F. Baumeister, 1903; price 2s. 3d.). The thesis that Babylonian influences continued to affect Jewish thought down to the Christian era and beyond it, is familiar to readers of the same author's *Schöpfung und Chaos*. The present work applies the same principles in detail to a great many features of the Gospel narratives and other portions of the N.T., particularly the Apocalypse, and aims at tracing the presence of elements borrowed from various Oriental religions. Gunkel, we are firmly persuaded, allows his fancy at times too much rein, but his suggestions are always striking, and his book is a mine of information.

In *Der Apostolos der Syrer in der Zeit von der Mitte des vierten Jahrhunderts bis zur Spaltung der Syrischen Kirche* (Giessen: J. Ricker, 1903; price M.1.80), Lic. Dr. Walter Bauer of Marburg handles the important question of the position of the so-called 'Apostle'¹ in the Canon of the Syrian Church during the century beginning with 350 A.D. He succeeds in showing that the closing of the Canon was much later in being accomplished there than in the Western Church, although there are some questions to which no certain answer can as yet be given. The book closes with a handy summary of the author's conclusions, and a supplementary note on Harnack's hypothesis about Diodore of Tarsus.

Old Testament students will welcome Dr. Hugo Gressmann's brochure on *Musik und Musikinstrumente im Alten Testament* (Giessen: J. Ricker, 1903; price 75 pfennigs). This is a subject involved in much obscurity. The legendary accounts of the invention of musical instruments by Jubal (Gn 4²¹) and the scanty data the O.T. supplies as to the history of music are discussed by Dr. Gressmann in an instructive way, and then the names of the various kinds of musical instruments mentioned in the O.T. are examined. This little work will prove an acquisition to the literature of the subject.

Professor H. L. Strack, to whom we are indebted for recent editions of the Mishnic tractates *Pirkê 'Abôth* and *'Aboda zara*, has published a (second) edition of the important tractate dealing with the Great Day of Atonement (*Joma*, zweite neubearbeitete Auflage; Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1904; price 80 pfennigs). It will receive a hearty welcome from the increasing number who are interested in this line of study.

There is no German theological writer who commands more attention and admiration in this country than Professor Harnack of Berlin. Many will, accordingly, be glad to hear that two handsome volumes of his *Reden und Aufsätze* have been issued (Giessen: J. Ricker, 1903; price in stiff covers M.10, bound M.12). These addresses and essays range over a period of twenty years, and embrace a great variety of subjects. The first volume is so arranged as practically to make up a

course in Church History, while the second deals with important Church problems of the present day. Amongst the subjects dealt with in the first volume are: Legends as sources of History, Socrates and the Ancient Church, Augustine's *Confessions*, Monasticism with its ideals and its history, the Apostles' Creed, etc. etc. In the second volume we have such subjects as: Christianity and History, the Present Position of Protestantism, the Present State of Research in early Church History, Ritschl and his School, etc. etc. Any one who acquires these two volumes will make a very good investment.

What was the Book of the Law found by Hilkiah in the temple, and which formed the basis of king Josiah's reforms? Not Deuteronomy in any form, says Dr. S. A. Fries of Stockholm (*Die Gesetzeschrift des Königs Josiah*; Leipzig: A. Deichert, 1903; price M.1.80). For a variety of reasons our author prefers to identify the סֵפֶר הַתּוֹרָה with the so-called Second Decalogue contained in Ex 34. He has not convinced us, but we have found his book interesting and suggestive.

Under the title of *Samaria und seine Propheten* (Tübingen und Leipzig: J. C. B. Mohr; London: Williams & Norgate, 1903; price 4s. net) Dr. Lincke of Jena has written a work, of whose learning there can be no question, but whose purpose we have often failed to fathom. Perhaps other readers may be more fortunate. But of one thing we are firmly convinced, namely, that the part assumed to be played by Phokylides and Pythagoras, nay even by Zoroaster, in shaping the religion of Israel, is for the most part imaginary.

We have read with very great pleasure Professor A. Bertholet's *Der Buddhismus und seine Bedeutung für unser Geistesleben* (Tübingen und Leipzig: J. C. B. Mohr, 1904; price M.1), which runs upon the same lines as the same author's *Buddhismus und Christentum*, which we noticed in these pages some time ago. The reader will find here a thoroughly reliable account of the history and tendencies of what is at present the numerically preponderating faith of the world. Dr. Bertholet's exposition of the *ethical* tendencies of Buddhism is all the more timely, in view of the propaganda which is being carried on on behalf of that religion

¹ That is, the Books outside the Gospels.

even in Europe. Germany has at times been accused of indifference to the science of Comparative Religion, but that reproach, if it exists, will soon be done away. Dr. Bertholet, we are glad to

observe, is one of the principal organizers of the International Congress for the History of Religion to be held at Basel in the end of August of this year.

A Prophet of the New Israel.

A STUDY IN THE FIRST EPISTLE OF PETER.

BY PROFESSOR THE REV. R. A. FALCONER, B.D., D.LITT., HALIFAX, N.S.

ONE of the most striking proofs of the devotion of the early Church to Jesus as Messiah is the fact that those who had been Jews, inheriting intense national pride, were willing to transfer the promises of Israel to Gentiles. A rabble without national, social, or moral conscience becomes aware that it is a chosen race, a holy nation. Slaves to inherited evil instincts, swept on, not unwillingly, in a current of Gentile profligacy, they exchange an irresponsible individualism for the moral obligations of a brotherhood scattered over the world, and became the new Israel, heirs of the divine covenants. The terms on which this transference was made were simply absolute devotion to Jesus Christ. He was of such transcendent worth that faith in Him obliterated all distinctions of race or station.

No Epistle of the New Testament illustrates this religious revolution better than 1 Peter. For it was written by a Jew, and its readers were Gentiles. Indeed, they were so predominantly Gentile that the stock problems caused by the two sections of early Christendom do not emerge. Their former life seems to have been on the average low level of morality in Asia Minor, with more or less drunkenness, impurity, and idolatry. Their conduct as heathen may have justified the criminal charges which were brought against them as Christians (2¹² 4^{15, 16}). Nor was this confined to such as were slaves, for there were among them many who enjoyed the rights of citizens and of regular family life. Naturally, the reserve of ethical power upon which Christians with such antecedents could draw was small, and there is no reason for surprise at the constant appeals for what we have come to regard as axiomatic morality. *Noblesse oblige* would be an impotent motto. Even the sense of brotherhood seems to have been weak.

Paul's letters to Galatia, Corinth, Rome, and Ephesus have the same type of Christian in view. Indeed, it is in the practical treatment of conduct that 1 Peter agrees most obviously with Romans and Ephesians. In matters, for example, of marriage, slavery, obedience to state authorities, and common morals, we can trace some literary connexion between these Epistles. There were, of course, common Christian life and manners created by no individual apostle. The drift from accumulated Jewish morality had for years been cast upon the inhospitable shores of heathenism, and in all the Gentile churches there was a large number of Jewish-Christians and proselytes, who, when the gospel was first preached, spontaneously accepted Christianity as the ideal for which they had been longing. The new spirit carried on its genial current much fruit of a brighter world, but like the Gulf Stream creating a new spring, it also forced into blossom the hardy stranded seeds of Jewish life. It is, however, quite probable that under the direction of Paul a normal standard of Christian conduct may have been worked out for the Gentiles. In Asia Minor, at least, his estimates on practical issues would be precedents. The First Epistle of Peter, directed to churches within similar geographical limits to the Pauline missions, faces almost the same ethical situation as Paul's, and handles it in the same way, though there was probably a common Christian ideal behind them both. By the time of the Apocalypse new factors have come in.

The churches were suffering for their faith. Whatever the persecution was it was universal (5⁹). The same sufferings were endured by the brotherhood throughout the world, and were incidental to the confession of Christianity (4¹⁶). Though Rome has grown hostile, and is known to the

brotherhood as Babylon, it is quite improbable that there are in this letter signs of an official persecution, for by obedience to emperor and governors the Christian may hope to silence the prejudice of enemies, who are unable to comprehend the new life. There seems to have been a systematic campaign of slander, prompted in many cases by the hatred of former comrades, to whose excess the conversion of their old friends was a constant rebuke (4^{4, 5}). In other instances it was excited, we may suppose, by haughty bearing on the part of Christians, who used a freedom superior to conventional restrictions, and who may have exercised a self-constituted censorship on the morals of their neighbours, or have become too inquisitive of their affairs (2¹⁶ 3¹³ 4¹⁵). Doubtless many suffered death on false charges, the figure of the lion ravening for his prey being suitable for a persecution that was often fatal, though the affliction of the Christian in general was an anxiety which he was to cast upon God (5⁷). Slaves seem merely to have suffered the common lot of slavery under perverse masters, aggravated by their religious convictions. The one remedy is to continue in well-doing, and to commit their lives to a faithful Creator.

It was to this distressed company acquainted with the new experience of suffering for conscience' sake, with no glorious ancestry of moral heroes like those of Hebrews 11 to inspire them in the evil day, to whom this prophet sends his message of hope, his appeal for obedience, and his interpretation of their source of power. A prophet was needed for such an hour. The brotherhood might lose their faith at a moment when calmness and sobriety were essential to salvation. They must be alert. The established moralities must be maintained. By a purer life they must exhibit the virtues of God to the heathen world in the face of severe opposition.

A melodious note of exultation, not so defiant as in the Apocalypse, rings through the Epistle. There has been a great deliverance, partly enjoyed in the present, but on the eve of full accomplishment. The revelation of the glory of Jesus Christ is not far distant. Some tremendous facts lie behind this conviction, for the hoped-for salvation is no new thing, but is so important that all history has been converging upon it (1¹⁰⁻¹²). These facts constitute the Gospel, which is the Word of the living God. There has ever been but one Word of

God, whether in old Israel or in the new (1²³⁻²⁵), and as it had come to the prophet in days past, so the gospel was preached to these Gentiles as a living power. This gospel is the Word of Truth instinct with life. The Hebrews of the prophetic age had a conception of the living or spoken word which was not unlike that of the Greeks; but the Jewish, or especially the Pharisaic, view had dominated religion by its worship of the written letter. Precisely as does the author of Hebrews, Peter speaks of the eternal and abiding Word of God. It goes down into men's hearts, making them face spiritual issues (He 4¹²⁻¹³). This gospel is a body of living truth quickened by some personal quality that enabled it to adjust itself to its new environment. It was truth just because it could fit itself into the situation of each individual. The truths of the gospel were practical truths, but they were also intellectual convictions, facts demanding obedience which may be summarized as 'the faith.' Faith on one side is obedience to moral convictions; it consists of spiritual truths towards which one may not assume an attitude of reserve (1²² 5⁹⁻¹²). The gospel was proving itself to be the Word of God by the way in which it met the needs of the heathen world. Doubtless its success was an immense confirmatory evidence of its universal truth to the first missionaries. Their words took wings and fled fast and far, and found lodgment in strange hearts. To make the Peter who preached to the Samaritans and to Cornelius the rigid standard whereby to judge all his after-life, is to overlook the fact that a man learns vastly by preaching his gospel. He does not know its scope and depth till he has tested it in new worlds. And we cannot doubt that the glad response of the Gentiles disclosed to Peter something more of its range as the abiding and living Word of God, which is the Truth.

It is not difficult to gather from this letter some of the pregnant facts, primary or confirmatory, which constituted the living and abiding Word of God preached to them with regenerating power.

1. There was the primary fact of the life and death of Jesus Christ. He has become for these Gentiles their pattern and their Redeemer. It is evident from this Epistle that the life and teachings of the Lord were essential elements in the gospel of Peter. In this respect he differs from Paul, whose letters lay more stress on the risen Christ. The favourite term for his Master

is 'the Christ' or 'Christ.' Unlike the author of Hebrews, he does not say 'Jesus'; unlike Paul, he does not use 'Christ Jesus.' Three times the favourite Pauline phrase, 'in Christ,' occurs, but only twice in the Pauline sense, and then in such a way as to suggest that it was a stereotyped Christian expression (3¹⁶ 5¹⁰).

(a) *Reminiscences of the teaching of Jesus Christ.*—He is pre-eminently the Messiah, and as such is to be obeyed. They must follow in His steps. The great command of Jesus to renounce everything in order to follow Him, even to taking up the cross, might be the keynote of this Epistle. As Jesus pronounced blessings on those who are reproached or persecuted for His sake, so does Peter. Echoes of the words of Jesus, 'Fear not those who kill the body but cannot kill the soul,' may be heard in 1 P 3¹³⁻¹⁶ 5⁶⁻⁹; and when the apostle bids them cast all their anxious care upon God and entrust themselves in well-doing unto a faithful Creator, we catch memories of the Sermon on the Mount; as again its words, 'Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father who is in heaven,' seem to run like an undertone through 1 P 2¹² 4¹⁶. Readiness to give an answer concerning their Christian hope is not unlike the state in which Christ exhorts His disciples to be in their day of trial (Mt 10¹⁹). As in the Parable of the Sower, the good seed is sown in the heart; and Jesus speaks to Nicodemus of the new birth, as Peter does of having been begotten again. There is no trace of the Pauline doctrine of sonship through adoption.

No book outside the Gospels touches more finely than 1 Peter on the duties of the Christian brotherhood: none has caught more of the Master's Spirit, who was so earnest that the disciples should fulfil the new law of love one to another. Christianity is not thought of as an organized Church, though apparently in 5¹ the elders are officials. It is a band of brothers among whom, as Jesus taught, service and humility give rank. The warnings against 'discontent with their office, greed and ambition' (5^{2, 3}), together with the pastoral figure employed, are strongly suggestive of the warning of Jesus to His disciples not to follow the ways of the world's lords, nor to allow themselves such honours as the Pharisees accepted; and especially of the parting command of Jesus to Peter to feed His sheep. In regard to their con-

duct under worldly governments the incident of the tribute-money may have been the source of Peter's advice (2^{13, 14}).

The certainty of Christ's return to reveal His glory and to judge the world was, of course, a Christian commonplace, as also the warning to watchfulness, but it is peculiarly emphatic in this Epistle, the cause perhaps being Peter's vivid memories of Christ's words. The rejection of Jesus by His people, bringing with it their own rejection, the rise of a new Israel and a new Temple, was a frequent theme of the Master's discourse, but the disciples learned it reluctantly with hard experience. However, by the time that this letter was written the apostle has thoroughly assimilated His Lord's teaching (2⁶⁻¹⁰).

(b) *The life and death of Christ.*—The memories of far-off days cluster round a Person of marvellous character. He was the Righteous One. He had perfect trust in His Father; when reviled He reviled not again, nor threatened under suffering. The Christ whom he knew was the Suffering Servant. The memory of the sinless Sufferer constantly rises to the surface of his thought. Such agony completing such a spotless life could be nothing but the fulfilment of Old Testament prophecy of the Servant of the Lord. That perfect endurance becomes the perfect ideal for every Christian under trial; but it is more. Steeped in prophetic thought, a Hebrew whose nation's history is typical, he believes that the new Israel is also delivered from the bondage of its Egypt by the death of its paschal lamb. By His blood a new covenant has been ratified. By His bruise we are healed. There are undoubted similarities in this view of Christ's death both to the conceptions of Paul and of Hebrews, but the prophetic ideas rule.

We may do well to estimate the impression produced by Jesus Christ upon the mind of Peter. He claims to have seen Jesus in the flesh, to have been an eyewitness of His sufferings—the reproaches, the buffetings, the marring. Yet he now assigns to Him the attributes of Jehovah, places Him at the right hand of God, with whom also He existed before the world (1²⁰). He finds Him moving in the mind of the prophets (1¹¹); declares that His death only set Him free for a wider mission (3¹⁸); makes Him the Sovereign of His heart (3¹⁵), and is convinced that He will return in glory. That a man who knew Jesus on earth could invest Him with such majesty is a wonderful fact.

But stranger still, the gospel preached to these Gentiles had awakened in them a passionate love to Jesus as a living Person whom they had never seen. How deep must have been the debt they owed Him as their Redeemer to call forth such affection. He is also a living Person, to whom they come in order to form with Him in their brotherhood a new Temple, wherein sacrifices of the best they have to give are offered and accepted by God for His sake. His sacrifice removes for ever the ritual of an official priesthood, and the brethren become priests in the service of a King. Whence issued the dynamic of their faith in this Person?

2. It came, in part at least, from another tremendous fact, to which the first disciples testified as of the essence of the gospel—the Resurrection of Jesus Christ. By this fact a new belief in God has been made possible (1²¹). It also gave validity to the assurance they received in Baptism of a good conscience (3²¹). A loyal trust in God and a living hope in His power have been created in Gentile hearts. Their future has become real and assured; for the Resurrection brought with it the conviction of Christ's Return. Glimpses of the coming glory of Christ had been vouchsafed to Peter, and his testimony had so impressed the common Christian mind that a living hope had sprung forth. The believer is heir to an inheritance free from ravage, pollution, or decay.

3. There was also a confirmatory fact in the experience of these Gentiles, which enabled them to share the conviction of early Christendom, that Jesus Christ was risen, and had become the Lord on whom they lavished their devotion. This was the presence of the Holy Spirit. They enjoy even here a foretaste of divine glory that defies expression. The Spirit was sent to them from heaven, consecrating them as the new Israel, and fulfilling in them the promise of the Messianic age (1^{2, 12}). In their ability to endure suffering, also, they feel that they have divine grace coming from the Spirit of God, which had been foretold by the prophets as one of the endowments of Messiah (4¹⁴, cf. Is. 11²).

It is very evident that Peter regards Christ from quite an original point of view. For Paul, Christ was the end of the Law. In this Epistle there is no mention of the Law. Nor is there any formal likeness to the favourite Pauline thought of the mystical union of the believer with Christ, com-

bined with that of His Spirit reproducing in each the graces of the divine character. For Peter, Christ is of course a living Person; but He is thought of chiefly as the exalted Messiah, who has made divine salvation and grace effective. On the other hand, there is much similarity to Hebrews, whose author looks to Jesus as the Captain and Perfecter of faith; the great Intercessor introducing His brethren to God. Relatively, as compared with the Pauline Epistles, the name of God occurs oftener in 1 Peter than that of Christ. He has introduced the believer to God, in whose presence he henceforth abides. Thus two fundamental religious ideas lie side by side in this Epistle. Christ is alive; believers come to Him; He is sanctified in their hearts, though He will be only fully revealed at the last day. But it is under the shadow of the Almighty, in the secret place of the Most High, that the Christian dwelleth. Peter speaks like an Old Testament prophet who has drunk deeply of the teaching of Jesus. God is the faithful Creator, but also the Holy Father of the new Israel. His name is to be hallowed. His strong hand guides every event (1⁵ 4¹⁹ 5⁶), and on Him His children should cast every care. Out of His infinite mercy He forgives sins. He is the Shepherd of lost sheep. His presence is over every soul. On Him faith and hope are fixed. He is the Judge who will judge righteously. Holiness is as essential to the God of Peter as to the Jehovah of Isaiah. These words of Isaiah might be used by Peter: 'Jehovah your Holy One, the Creator of Israel your King. . . . Jehovah, God, merciful and gracious, longsuffering, abundant in goodness and truth, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin, and who will by no means clear the guilty.'

The prophetic conception of the Day of the Lord received reinforcement from the teaching of Jesus, and is prominent in this Epistle; but, like an Israelite of old, Peter finds the divine retribution now at work in the world, as when he completes his threat, 'It is time for judgment to begin at the house of God,' with words taken from the verse, 'Behold even the righteous shall be recompensed on the earth: how much more the wicked and the sinner.' His teaching as to the purpose of trial also (1⁷) might well contain reminiscences of these words; 'Who may abide the coming of the Lord of hosts; for He shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver. . . . I will try them as gold is tried: they shall call upon my name and I will hear them: I will

say, It is my people : and they shall say, The Lord is my God.'

Like the writer of Hebrews, Peter believes that the people of God have always been one. So the experiences of Israel in Canaan are paralleled with those of the new Israel, who as pilgrims and strangers on earth press forward to their heavenly inheritance. Faith is, as in Hebrews, the strong conviction of the reality of that invisible realm, and trust in God as the one who makes their hope valid. Such faith and hope in the grace that is coming to them at the revelation of Jesus Christ enable them to endure present sufferings. Meantime they must obey. This is the world of Hebrews rather than of Paul.

There is, however, one remarkable omission from the old prophetic ideal. I refer to the kingdom of God. The prophets counted the Law, whether in code or ritual, as secondary, and it need not occasion surprise that Peter has little to say of the Pharisaic or the ceremonial conceptions of religion. But the kingdom of God was for the prophet the final issue. Probably this omission is due to the fact that the promiscuous throng of Gentiles, many of them slaves, to whom Peter is writing, would associate no worthy ideas with a term which signified to them oppression rather than freedom. National and patriotic sense was dead in these variously assorted provincials. All the blessings they knew had come to them first in a fellowship of brethren, in which a new love had given them a new life. In a hostile world they had found a home where they had learned to call God Father. This was to them a higher conception than King. Nor would any sacred or holy memories gather round temple or altar, seeing that their worship had been either the imperial cultus or abominable idolatries. The Christain brotherhood becomes the Christian Temple. Curiously enough believers are not called 'saints,' as in Paul and in Hebrews, though holiness is the essential quality in their character. Like the Israelite, Peter thinks of the brethren collectively as a 'holy nation,' a 'holy

priesthood'—an entity compacted not by organization but by 'true grace,' a living temple held together by one Person.

The death of the Suffering Messiah has not only ransomed the new Israel, but becomes within it the possibility of a new life of righteousness. His resurrection brings new hope. Christ Himself is the ideal. Love is the law of the brotherhood. Because of the Christain facts moral enthusiasm awakens to more earnest endeavour. It puts forth strenuous effort to cut through the tough overgrowth of old heathen customs, so that the light and warmth of grace may cause the seed of the gospel to blossom into the virtues of God, turning a wilderness into an unfading inheritance. No Epistle of the New Testament glows with a purer moral fervour. Whatever opinion may be held as to other books, there is not in 1 Peter the slightest trace of the deteriorated conception of Christianity as a new Law, a bundle of precepts and doctrines—that persistent idea which can only be dissipated by faith at a white heat, and which encrusted its surface after the cooling draughts of worldliness had played upon it for some generations. Christianity is still a living power. While Peter does recognize that a normal outward conduct is approved by the conscience of his readers; his purpose is to set forth the true grace of God (5¹²). He grounds precept in religious motive. And withal from an irreversible conviction of the truth of his gospel. It is not for Peter to theorize, but to obey with a loyal soul. His steadfast hope does not kindle a glorious imagination like John's; but it vitalizes his message of comfort to those in suffering, of encouragement to the hopeless. To love the Lord with all the heart, soul, strength, and mind is for him the first and great commandment, and the second is like unto it—to love thy neighbour as thyself. Life is obedience to a holy Father. Peter speaks gently, as a shepherd to his flock, but in the old presbyter there slumbers prophetic fire ready to leap forth and consume should sin desecrate the house of God.

At the Literary Table.

THE BIBLE IN ENGLISH.

The Bible House.

THERE has been a great deal of writing about the English versions of the Bible, and a great deal of it is of no use. There is scarcely any study upon which so many useless books have been written. The earliest writers made mistakes, the later repeated them. Only here and there a worker like Westcott or Moulton took the trouble to investigate for themselves and add anything to our information.

More books will be written now than ever. For the British and Foreign Bible Society has set two of its capable men to compile a list and give a sufficient description of all the printed editions of the Bible in English, as they are contained in the Library of the Society. The result is the handsome volume before us. Another volume will do likewise for the editions in foreign tongues. So we say we shall have more books than ever on the English versions, it will be so very easy to write them now. But they will be more accurate. It will be an everlasting disgrace if any man with this volume in his hands repeats the blunders that have hitherto been so common about the printed editions of the Bible in English.

It is a book for the lover of books. It is art as well as science. How beautiful is the white paper, how broad the margin, how clear and leisurely the type. And it is a book-lover's book in price. The two volumes must be taken together, and they cost 31s. 6d. net. For it is a large as well as a costly book to produce. This volume contains the record of 1410 editions of the English Bible or part of it. And there is always a description of the book, its title-page, size, price, and much more. The last entry in time is that of the Revised Version with revised marginal references, printed at the University Presses for the Centenary of the British and Foreign Bible Society of this year.

THE CAMBRIDGE MODERN HISTORY.

Cambridge: *At the University Press.* 16s. net.

The subject of the new (it is the second) volume of *The Cambridge Modern History* is the Reformation. It will be to many the subject and the volume by which this great undertaking

will be finally tested. First of all, who are the authors?

Professor Kraus of Munich (since dead) has written the first chapter on Medicean Rome. Mr. Stanley Leathes, one of the three editors, has written the second and third chapters on Hapsburg and Valois. Principal Lindsay of Glasgow has written the fourth chapter on Luther. Professor A. F. Pollard of University College has written chapters v. to viii. on the Reformation in Germany, and chapter xiv. on the Reformation in England under Edward vi. Mr. A. A. Tilley does France, and Principal Whitney of Quebec, Switzerland. Principal Fairbairn writes the eleventh chapter on Calvin and the Reformed Church, and the nineteenth on the Tendencies of European Thought in the Age of the Reformation. And the others are Bishop Collins, Dr. Gairdner, Mr. Bass Mullinger, Dr. F. W. Maitland, and Mr. R. V. Laurence.

Now the work. We start with Luther. If Luther is mismanaged, the rest will suffer shipwreck; if Luther is well done, the whole book is safe. Principal Lindsay was the inevitable choice, but we began with fear. For had he not written Luther in the 'Epoch-Makers' series, and how could he twice in succession be superlative on the same theme? And how could he pack into forty pages what was there a volume without a word to spare? But there was no disappointment. Luther was never made more human or more mighty than in these forty pages. After that the most likely piece was the last, but it was better to leave it to the last. When we came to it through utmost variety of country, there was no mistaking the authorship, there was no missing the elevation of the style and the triumph of the thought. It is not at all likely that another volume will have so resonant or so revelant an ending.

One doubt remains. Could not Dr. Lindsay or Dr. Fairbairn or Dr. Collins have written the whole volume? And would it not have been better if they had? This is not a dictionary. It is intended that this volume should be read right through. But the variety is very disturbing. No doubt every man has ability. But every man has also his own manner, which here and there it takes most of the chapter to forget. He is done before

we have felt at home with him. That, however, is to challenge the whole conception. And we are ready to confess that the very variety has advantages.

THE WORSHIP OF THE DEAD.

Chapman & Hall. 12s. 6d. net.

It is startling to come upon an 'army man' engrossed with Comparative Religion. No doubt the field is large enough for many workers. But the vastness and intricacy of the subject makes the surprise greater. We expect special training, and special linguistic training, in one who is to make anything of the study of Comparative Religion; and it is not among the Royal Engineers we look first for that. Yet Colonel Garnier has written a large book on the most difficult of all the problems belonging to Comparative Religion and boldly challenges refutation.

The problem is the origin of the Gods. It is another problem from the origin of Religion. We may agree with Colonel Garnier that all the gods were originally men on earth and all the goddesses originally women, and be no nearer an explanation of the origin of Religion. Colonel Garnier does not discuss the origin of Religion. His subject is the origin of the Gods and Goddesses; and, as we have just said, he believes that they were all at one time men or women.

That is why he calls his book *The Worship of the Dead*. Zeus as a Homeric Olympian is a great god and highly exalted. But you can trace the evolution of the great god Zeus. Even in Greece itself you find him worshipped as a god of the earth, with Chthonian rites. And if you go farther back still, you find him—probably in Babylonia, says Colonel Garnier—no god at all, but a hero of the Nimrod order. And Nimrod was of course a masterful man in his day.

Nor is this all. If the great gods were once but men, then the early and so-called mythological history of the nations of the earth is not mythological at all. It is not mythological in the sense of not being historical. Nimrod and Abraham, and Prometheus and Minos, and all the rest were once men of like passions such as we are, and did the deeds which, with whatever foolish embroidery, are attributed to them.

Very good. But even that is not all. And now Colonel Garnier is very daring, and we must not risk our necks to follow him. For he holds that

the gods and goddesses of all the nations from Ireland in the West to Japan in the East, all the gods and goddesses of Babylon, Egypt, Greece, Persia, India, and the islands of the sea, were originally one and the same god. There are many names, there is but one god. His earliest name was probably Cush. Cush and Cronos are one. Zeus is the son of Cronos, that is the son of Cush, and that is Cush. For sonship means merely emigration. It is a fascinating study. It is a fascinating book.

JEREMY TAYLOR.

Macmillan. 2s. net.

Mr. Edmund Gosse is himself an 'English Man of Letters,' and when he was invited to write the life of Jeremy Taylor for the 'English Men of Letters' Series, he interpreted the phrase strictly and stuck to it. He has written—not a life of Jeremy Taylor, who was a religious man—but of the Jeremy Taylor who wrote books and was somewhat tossed in the ecclesiastical turmoil of his time. It is a literary, or at best literary and ecclesiastical, biography. We must go elsewhere for Jeremy Taylor of the 'Holy Living and Dying' interest.

But as a literary biography it is very good. It describes this English author and it has distinction. It is both Jeremy Taylor and Edmund Gosse. And it will have to be considered by all subsequent biographers. For in his capacity of literary critic Mr. Gosse discredits the whole of the stories that are attached to the name of Lady Wray, while he gives good internal reasons for denying to Jeremy Taylor the authorship of that treatise in favour of the use of cosmetics, called *Auxiliary Beauty*. He believes that brochure to be the work of a lady, an unconscious imitator of Taylor's style, as when she speaks of 'persons who sometimes appear pallidly sad, as if they were going to their graves, otherwhiles with such a rosy cheerfulness, as if they had begun their resurrection,' but still only an imitator.

Here is a specimen of Mr. Gosse's way in the chapter on 'Taylor's Place in Literary History':—'He writes with extraordinary happiness about light and water. Nothing would be easier, if we had the space, than to produce an anthology from his works, and confine it scrupulously to these two themes. He is quick, beyond any other man living, in observing the effects of flashes of lightning in a dark room, of beams of the sun breaking

through the vapour of rain, and divided by it into sheaves of rays, of wax candles burning in the sunshine, of different qualities of beautiful radiance in the eyes of a woman, of a child, of a hawk. Light escaping from, or dispersed by, or streaming through cloud, is incessantly interesting to him. But perhaps it is in all the forms of water that he most delights, water bubbling up through turf, or standing in drops on stone, or racing down a country lane; the motion and whisper of little wandering rivulets; the "purls of a spring that sweats through the bottom of a bank, and intenerates the stubborn pavement till it hath made it fit for the impression of a child's foot." He seems to have been for ever watching the eddies of the Towey and the windings and bubbleings of its tributaries, and the music of those erratic waters passed into his speech.

Other Books of the Month.

THE GENERAL EPISTLE OF ST. JAMES.

We are almost inclined to say that the Epistle of St. James has been waiting for this expositor, so thorough and so wise does Mr. St. John Parry's exposition seem to us to be (Cambridge University Press; 5s. net). It is not an exposition in the ordinary sense, it would be called an introduction most readily. But it is an introduction to the thought and language of the Epistle, very little of which is left untouched. Mr. Parry finds that instead of being a string of aphorisms the Epistle of St. James has one theme throughout. That theme is the possibility of overcoming temptation to sin. It is shown that the temptation may be overcome by faith and wisdom leading to endurance. Mr. Parry has his opinion about the date and authorship also, but we need not mind that.

THE CHRISTIAN ETHICS OF SOCIAL LIFE.

There is abundant writing on Christian socialism; the danger is that it is to become too abundant. For this wonderful discovery of our day that no man liveth to himself, is not all that Christianity stands for. It is not all that Christ came to give. Nor is it what Christ came to give first of all. First of all He spoke to the single man like Nathanael, 'I saw thee'; and the single woman, like the Samaritan. And this we take to be the great merit and exceeding value of the Rev.

William Dickie's new book, that the individual is seen and seized before socialism begins. His book has five sections, and the title of the first of the five is 'The Individual—the Centre.' For the individual must get right with God before he can adjust himself aright to his fellow. The first commandment is 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God,' and it will always be first, however closely the second follows it. When Mr. Dickie comes to the second commandment—'thy neighbour as thyself'—which is the subject of his book, he is very satisfactory. He works his way in ever widening circles, from the Domestic Circle, through the Church Circle, and the Social Circle, to the World Circle. And he not only has something to say as he goes, he takes account as he goes of all he has said and of all he is going to say, till the subject is completed—a proportioned finished statement of what the man in Christ Jesus has to be in all his intercourse with his brother man (Dent; 3s. 6d. net).

THE BOOK OF JOB.

No apology is needed for sending into the world a new commentary on the Book of Job, and Dr. Bullinger makes none. If the commentary has nothing in it, we can simply pass it by. Dr. Bullinger tells us what is in his commentary. Besides the Introduction, which is good popular writing, there is a new translation of the Book of Job. The translation is rhythmical: it follows the literary structure of the Book; it renders the figures of speech not literally but by English figures of speech; it is not a verbal translation, as Dr. Bullinger says the Revised Version is, but an idiomatic version, like the Authorized Version; it follows Ginsburg's critical text; and, lastly, it distinguishes to the eye the Hebrew names for God.

Here is plenty of novelty. And it is apparently honest hard work. What it must have cost the author to turn Job into decasyllabics, none but himself can know. Let us test the result by the best known passage (xix. 25-27)—

I know that my Redeemer ever lives,
And at the latter day on earth shall stand;
And after they consume my skin, [ev'n] this—
Yet in my flesh I shall Eloah see:
Whom I, ev'n I, shall see upon my side.
Mine eyes shall see Him—stranger, now, no more,
[For this] my inmost soul with longing waits.

There is a footnote to explain the 'they' of the

third line. It is the worms Job means here, but they are not named. As in all religion, and elsewhere in this Book, the instruments of God's judgments are indicated vaguely by the pronoun.

The publishers are Messrs. Eyre & Spottiswoode (5s.).

BY WAY OF REMEMBRANCE.

The title of this volume of sermons is chosen no doubt for the sake of the people who worship in Stoke Newington Church, where the sermons were preached before Mr. Shelford was appointed Vicar of St. Martin-in-the-Fields. They are short sermons, and it has cost the author something to make them short. For they are the result of careful study of the Word, and often contain new and attractive interpretations (Wells Gardner; 3s. 6d.).

STUDIES IN THE TEACHING OF OUR LORD.

Professor Swete's little book, which Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton have published (3s. 6d.), will be found as easy and as reliable an introduction to the new study of the Gospels as exists. To the new study—the study that is critical and yet not destructive, the study that is historical and yet most spiritual. The sources are separated, but the gospel is intact, more credible, more acceptable. Do not listen to those who cry out against the critical study of the Gospels: read this book.

HORÆ BIBLICÆ.

The Rev. Arthur Carr has gathered into this volume a number of contributions made to the *Expositor* on the language and thought of the New Testament. There are two articles on Old Testament themes, but it is the New Testament Mr. Carr loves and knows. His joy is great when he discovers a new interpretation, or when he resolves to his own content an old crux. And he is just the man for that kind of work. An accent is not beneath his notice. Should we translate Jn 7⁵² 'a prophet' or 'the prophet'? He spends much thought on such minutiae, for he knows that only so does the knowledge of the Word of God make progress among us. And he is never content with a verbal result. He opens the way through grammar to the golden gates (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s.).

THE SELF-PORTRAITURE OF JESUS.

What did our Lord think of Himself? It is the question of questions. What we think of Him is always poor, and sometimes perverse. What He thought of Himself, if we could but get at that, is satisfactory. For He never underrated or overestimated Himself. He knew what was in Himself as well as He knew what was in man. So it was with much hope, which has not been disappointed, that we took up this unpretending but very loyal book by the Rev. J. M. E. Ross on *The Self-Portraiture of Jesus* (Hodder & Stoughton; 3s. 6d.). We can believe that it was not easy for Mr. Ross to pack it all into one volume. One of his chapters—or sermons if they are—the sermon on the Bread of Life for example, could have grown till the volume was filled with it.

CONFESSION AND ABSOLUTION.

Of all the practices which characterize the High Church movement, the practice of private confession and absolution is most offensive to the Low Churchman. In that lies the power of the movement, in that its poison. What is the Low Churchman to do? Declare what is the true doctrine and practice of Confession and Absolution? That may be of no use. He must declare what is the doctrine of the Church of England. He must show how far the High Churchman has a right to go.

The Principal of Ridley Hall has written his book to show what is the law of the Church of England on Confession and Absolution. He interprets the Prayer Book by the published opinions of the men who had the making of it. He gathers the opinions of others like them. He shows what must have been meant by every word and every clause. And then he leaves the Bishops to act.

It is a fine-tempered scholar's book (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s.).

POLITICS AND RELIGION IN ANCIENT ISRAEL.

It is just as well that Canon Todd of Natal has put 'Politics' as well as 'Religion' into his title (Macmillan; 6s.). For there is a certain air of secularity about his book that otherwise would have offended. For instance: 'David's harem was not perhaps a novelty. Some of the old "judges" are said to have had large collections of

women. 'The monogamic principle has not yet been announced. But the murder of Uriah lies as an indelible stain on his character; and the harem was undoubtedly, both in David's reign and afterwards, the feature of the monarchy which produced the largest amount of confusion, instability, and bloodshed.'

Thus there is at least little suspicion of unctuousness, if there is not very much unction in Canon Todd's writing. In the present stress his book will be well received. For being above suspicion of pleading, it yet tells the story of a unique people uniquely led and ever toward a goal. And that is itself a great pleading for providence and inspiration. It is perhaps the most successful apologetic of our day, when the goal itself is taken account of. Canon Todd is an exact scholar and a fearless critic. Occasionally he rises clean out of the critical current, and claims individual attention for some new thought, or at least new memorable expression. His picture of 'Yahweh Zebaoth' is as sublime as it is unconventional. On the whole, we should be content to lose many recent books on the Old Testament sooner than this one. And it must be added that Messrs. Macmillan have made a fine attractive volume of it.

JUNIOR CHRISTIAN ENDEAVOUR.

It is fitting that Mrs. Francis Clark should be the writer of the book on *Christian Endeavour among the Children* (Melrose; 3s. 6d.). And Mrs. Clark has written it well. The book is a fine combination of keen feeling and practical method. The Junior Christian Endeavour is believed in as a great spiritual education; nothing is forgotten to make it a success.

INDIVIDUAL IMMORTALITY.

'If a man die, shall he live again?' It is curious that even yet we have to go to science and philosophy to help us to an answer. For those who sleep in Jesus, St. Paul's answer is sufficient. And it is not likely that Christian Science, or any other science or philosophy, will do more than say 'perhaps' to the rest. Miss Caillard has shown us here how far philosophy can take us, and how far science. She finds her rest, however, when she comes to the Christian ideal. And then she shows that the Christian ideal is broader and more beautiful than the ordinary Christian thinks. For immortality in

Christ is not the immortality of the soul, it is the immortality of *the whole man*, body, mind, and spirit (Murray).

THE CHURCH PULPIT YEAR-BOOK FOR 1904.

Is there room for a Pulpit Year-Book? It contains sermons only. Might it not contain other things also? But there are two sermons for every Sunday, one on the morning lesson and one on the evening. They are partly new and partly old. They are all condensed and well condensed. We shall see. The book deserves success, and may win it (Nisbet; 6s.).

THOMAS WAKEFIELD.

The Rev. Thomas Wakefield's name is little known outside his own beloved United Methodist Free Church. But he was a chosen vessel. His life's work lay in East Equatorial Africa. It lay in a daily dying for those who were none of his kinsmen according to the flesh. And whilst he was in labours abundant in the vineyard of the Master, he gathered some of that knowledge which passeth away. His researches into the Galla language, folklore, and religion are to be published in another volume. Here we have the work he did for eternity (R.T.S.; 3s. 6d.).

THE PEDAGOGICAL BIBLE SCHOOL.

If the title is unattractive, take the sub-title: 'A Scientific Study of the Sunday School, with chief reference to the Curriculum' (Revell; 5s. net). This month there is another book on the training of the young. It comes from America also, and from the same publishers. Both books deal with the moral rather than the intellectual training of the young, and in so doing they put us to shame. And both are scientific in their methods. But whereas Dr. Du Bois gives himself to the individual child, Mr. Haslett, the author of this volume, takes the children in mass as they are found at school. He shows the teacher what can be done for a class, not merely in the way of keeping it in order, but in the way of making it a force for righteousness in the earth. He has an eye for the social side of child-life. And it seems as if that were a step in advance of the man who sees only the individual child. For the secret of success is in persuading one child to train another, not in the teacher trying to train every child.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE DEATH OF CHRIST.

The Rev. Nathaniel Dimock, A.M., sometime vicar of St. Paul's, Maidstone, is one of the best scholars of historical theology, and one of the keenest evangelical disputants living. There is, in truth, only two ways of dealing with him. We must either agree with him or leave him alone. Now it is easier to leave him alone than it ought to be. He is so unfortunate in the making up of his books—what could be less attractive than this seven and sixpenny half-bound volume?—that it requires some resolution to attend to him. He is in dead earnest; he has no English style or other mercy to relieve or recommend his earnestness. Only those who have been told how great a scholar he is and how thorough in all his investigations, are likely to take up his book into their hands. Yet this volume is a mine of knowledge on the absorbing and central theme of the Death of Christ (Elliot Stock).

Messrs. A. & C. Black have determined to make themselves the publishers of all the great year-books. They could scarcely confer a better boon on a busy generation. Their latest issue is **The Englishwoman's Year-Book** (2s. 6d. net). The editor is Miss Emily Janes. This is the sixth year of issue in the new form of the book, the twenty-fourth year from the commencement. What does *The Englishwoman's Year-Book* contain? Practically everything about Englishwomen—their employments, their clubs, their colleges, the homes they have established and the hospitals, where they live and what they do, the books they write and the assumed names under which they write them, and very much more than that. There are two kinds of Englishwomen in our day, those who take life seriously and have *The Englishwoman's Year-Book* at their hand, and those who have not yet discovered what life is nor *The Englishwoman's Year-Book*.

It is now fairly well known that Dr. William Mair's book on **Speaking** (Blackwood) has made all other books on Speaking superfluous. Dr. Mair is a minister of the Church of Scotland, and his interest is in preaching. What is the good, he asks, of having a glorious gospel to preach if you cannot speak? Few ministers can speak as

Dr. Mair thinks they ought to speak. It is a matter of science and perseverance. The Church that studies this book will be the Church of the future.

Dr. George Smith has written many books on missionaries and their work. But the book which has made his name most widely known is the smallest of them all. It is his **Short History of Christian Missions**, one of Messrs. T. & T. Clark's 'Handbooks for Bible Classes and Private Students.' The latest edition is a thorough revision and up to date (2s. 6d.). It contains several excellent portraits of missionaries, and the frontispiece is a portrait of the author himself.

The Congregational Historical Society is very active. The fifth number of the *Transactions* has been published, and again it contains not only first-hand historical investigation, but a genuine and glad discovery. The discovery is of a lost treatise by Robert Browne. In a separate pamphlet the treatise is published, with an Introduction by Mr. Champlin Burrage. Its title is **A New Year's Gift**. (Memorial Hall, London, E.C.; 1s. 6d. net).

The Congregational Year-Book (Memorial Hall, London, E.C.) is of extraordinary value at the money (2s. 6d.). It contains 585 closely printed octavo pages, besides advertisements (which have their interest too) and other preliminary matter, together with some full-page illustrations. It contains 'The Proceedings of the Congregational Union for 1903, General Statistics of the Denomination, and other Miscellaneous Information.' The miscellaneous matter is quite well arranged, and it all bears upon the doings and endeavours of the Union, one large item being a list of all the Associations and the Churches in them, their ministers' and secretaries' names, and their membership; another, a complete list of the ministers in alphabetical order, with their degrees (*and where they got them*), and a record of their pastorates.

The Memorial Hall also issues the *Handbook* for 1904 (2d.) of the Young People's Union, a clever compact statement of the things that Congregational young people should know. It includes a Catechism of Congregationalism by the Rev. C. Silvester Horne.

The Old Testament series of the **Century Bible** has begun to appear, and it has begun with Genesis. The editor is Professor W. H. Bennett. It is an ideal start. For Genesis is still the book to open the Old Testament with, and Dr. Bennett is a typical scholar of the new generation. He is critical and he is reverent. He fears no tendencies, for he has found that the tendency is to Christ. His Introduction says good-bye for ever to the old unhistorical methods of Bible interpretation. And his notes are religious and to the point (Jack; 2s. 6d. net).

Messrs. Longmans have done much recently in the way of issuing small volumes of devotion. This month two of them have come. The one is called **The Witness of Love**, with the sub-title, 'some mysteries of the divine love revealed in the Passion of our Holy Redeemer.' The author is the Rev. Jesse Brett, L.Th. (2s. net). The other is a series of sermons on **The Lenten Collects** (1s. 6d. net).

Is the time coming when we shall have no books in our libraries that cost more than sixpence? The publishers are rushing all their best books into the market at that price. Here come Messrs. Longmans with Liddon's **Some Elements of Religion** and Romanes' **Thoughts on Religion**. It was the Rationalist Press Association that started the present rush of 'sixpennies.' It is nice to think we have something to thank them for.

The series of apologetic addresses which Mr. Murray has now published under the title of **Christian Apologetics** (2s. 6d. net) was made famous by the presence at the delivery of one of them of Lord Kelvin, and the controversy that arose over his remarks. But the volume is well worth attention for its own sake. Perhaps most of all on account of the striking discrepancy between the Introduction and the Contents. In the Introduction the Rev. W. D. M'Laren, M.A., tells us what Christian Apologetics is, and we do not think we ever saw it better told. Mr. M'Laren says most accurately that the essential distinction of the Christian Faith is that Jesus Christ is a trustworthy deliverer from the rule and the consequences of evil; and that its purpose, 'as many suppose,' is not to establish the divine origin or

authority, the truth or accuracy, of the Bible. And then when we go into the Contents of the book we find the Dean of Canterbury and some others concerned entirely with the accuracy and authority of the Bible. Nevertheless the addresses are striking modern manly efforts to commend the gospel, even if they do not all see what the gospel is. The most exciting to listen to must have been Mr. R. E. Welsh's, with its detailed story of Ellen Watson, who won the Rothschild Exhibition, called W. K. Clifford 'master,' and died repeating 'Lamb of God, that taketh away the sins of the world.'

Messrs. Nisbet & Co. have got hold of one Year-Book, and mean to keep their hold of it. It is **The Church Directory and Almanac** (2s. net). They mean to keep their hold of it by making it so full and accurate, and at the same time publishing it so cheaply, that no other publisher can possibly compete with them. As for its accuracy—we have worked with the book for two years and found only one trifling error in it.

Mr. Spurgeon's Biography came out in three (or was it four?) immense volumes; Mrs. Spurgeon's comes in one, tiny and slimly bound (Passmore & Alabaster; rs.). No doubt Mrs. Spurgeon's story was told along with her husband's. The big book was hers as well as his. Still there must have been material for a fuller book than this, and certainly she was worthy of it. Mr. Charles Ray tells what story there is. He has the requisite sense of sympathetic discrimination. The title is simply **Mrs. C. H. Spurgeon**.

Messrs. Rivingtons' series of 'Oxford Church Text-Books' has had a useful addition made to it in **A History of the American Church**, by the Bishop of Delaware. Of course it is the Episcopal Church that is meant. The story is carried right down to the end of last century. It is history by movement and by men. The great men and the great movements gather the history round them, and make it easy to read and remember.

The Scottish Reformation Society has published a handbook of **The Scottish Reformation** for Bible Classes (6d.). It is the work of a most capable author, Dr. Hay Fleming.

Mr. Stockwell publishes this month a volume of

Sermons by Congregational Preachers (2s. 6d. net); *Symbols of the Holy Spirit*, by the Rev. William Smith (1s. 6d. net); *What Congregationalists stand for*, by J. Hirst Hollowell (1s. 6d. net); and *Christ and Conscience*, by the Rev. C. Silvester Horne, M.A. (1s.).

The Sunday School Union has issued a manual of suggestions for Sunday School work with the title, *The Work of a Sunday School Union* (1s. net); and a clever catching book of lessons for infants, by Mr. G. A. Archibald, with the title, *Bible Lessons for Little Beginners* (2s. 6d.).

Among the smaller books and pamphlets of the month the following are noteworthy:—(1) *A Critical Examination of the so-called Moabite Inscription*,

by the Rev. Albert Löwy, LL.D., in which Dr. Löwy reasserts and strengthens his demand that the Inscription be called a forgery; (2) *Was Jesus a Carpenter?* by Ernest Crosby, who does not believe it; (3) *Spiritual Culture in the Theological Seminary*, by Dr. B. B. Warfield of Princeton, in his very best manner; (4) *Death and Sleep*, by the Rev. Carleton Greene, M.A. (Stock; 1s.), a collection of quotations from English poetry on their identity; (5) *Harnack and Loisy*, by the Rev. T. A. Lacey, M.A. (Longmans; 1s. net), with an introductory letter by the Right Hon. Viscount Halifax; *Science and Speculation*, by G. H. Lewes, a reprint (Watts; 6d.); and (7) *In Relief of Doubt*, by the Rev. R. E. Welsh, M.A. (Allenson; 6d.), a cheap edition of one of the very best answers to the modern rejection of a Redeemer.

Point and Illustration.

THERE is no sermon in recent literature more terrible in its plainness of speech and in its revelation of 'the brute in man,' than a sermon in Dr. Clifford's new volume, *The Secret of Jesus* (Brown; 3s. 6d.), which has the lamb-like title of 'The World's Coming Peace.' Here is a part of it—

The Brute in Man.—The *Indian Planter's Gazette* reads: 'Should we slay our brother Boer? He should be slain with the same ruthlessness that they slay a plague-infected rat. Exeter Hall may shriek, but there will be plenty of it, and the more the better. The Boer resistance will enable us to find an excuse to blot out the Boers as a nation and turn their land into a vast shambles.'

That is a sentence not altogether lacking in brutality, is it? The correspondent of a London daily writes of looting—

'Next to the fierce joy of fighting, that of satisfying the primeval instinct of robber man is the highest pleasure which war affords. Add the promise of plunder to the certainty of a fight, and you increase by tenfold the efficiency of any army in the world. If war is right, then in any case let the boys loot. If for policy or principle it be wise to let a man murder, then let him for his private gratification be a thief.'

That passage is not altogether wanting in brutality, is it?

The correspondent of the *Morning Post* writes thus—

'I felt a joy of satisfaction when the smoke of a rebel's farm went up. These unkempt, ill-conditioned rebels, these human vermin, have been treated as though on a level with respectable Kaffirs. A beast of a rebel was getting his deserts.'

And so I might go on.

It was George Eliot that said, 'Man is by nature an unmitigated savage; let him alone, and he

lapses into barbarism.' But Dr. Clifford does not let him alone.

The Rev. T. G. Selby has published another volume of sermons. This time through Mr. Robinson of Manchester. Its title is *The Alienated Crown* (4s. 6d. net). They are such sermons as read well. There is style and a becoming dignity. The reproofs are abundant, but they are not outbursts of sudden fire. Perhaps they move the more that they are so self-respecting. Here are two illustrations—

In his volume of war correspondence, entitled *From London to Ladysmith*, Mr. Winston Churchill tells of a curious incident which arose in the neighbourhood of the besieged city. The commander of the forces whose movements he was following was encamped only a few miles from Sir George White, and wished to encourage him after one of his brave attempts to break through the investing ranks of the enemy. Signals were flashed upon the clouds which, under ordinary circumstances, would have been easy for those in Ladysmith to decipher. But the Boers perceived what was being done, and confused the messages by throwing their own searchlight between the clouds and the eager eyes which were trying to spell out the code. And so the battle of the opposing signals went on mid-heaven. That weird spectacle is not unknown to the human consciousness. Conflicting messages register themselves there, messages from the animal and messages from the spiritual side of our personality, the alphabet of heaven mixing itself up into chaos with the alphabet of the nethermost pit.

An observant traveller tells us that it is a mistake to

suppose that there is absolutely no life in the waters of the Dead Sea. He had found tiny fish upon the margin, in the little eddies of fresh water formed by the scanty mountain streams as they emptied themselves into the weird welter of desolation. But what a pitiable and a precarious life! One would have thought the fish would have had wit enough to keep well up the stream and avoid this close contact with the realm of bitterness and death.

And do not some of us, while keeping in the little currents of Divine charity and good-will that flow about our daily lives, venture terribly near to the Dead Sea of the world's bitterness?

It is easy to be original in writing about the moral training of children, for few writers have considered it a subject worth writing upon. Perhaps it is not so easy to be original in America as it is here. In any case we have found a book by Dr. Patterson Du Bois the most original and charming book of the month. Its title is *The Natural Way in Moral Training* (Revell; 5s. net). Its chapters are few but very full of matter. Their titles are the Way of the Master, the Idea of Nurture, Nurture by Atmosphere, Nurture by Light, Nurture by Food, Nurture by Exercise, and the Discipline and the Practice. The titles may tell us nothing, because we are so unacquainted with it all. To an educational American the thoughts may be familiar enough. Well, if we are behind, let us try to make up. Let us read this absorbing book to begin with. It is full of good things by the way besides being good itself. Here are two of them—

Gray Breeches and Pillows of Fire.—Two comical instances of the persistency of children to adhere to the ideas which they have gained from a hurried and unexplained reading of the Bible story to them, occurred recently in my class. 'A good name is rather to be chosen than great riches' was the text. The child learned by ear, 'A good name is rather to be chosen than *gray breeches*.' It was almost impossible to get her to change those last two words, or to make her see that the text as it stands in the original made better sense.

This is the other instance. 'We were having for our lesson the Israelites leaving Egypt. Ten or twelve in the class had heard the passage read at home, probably without comment. As a unit they had taken the word "pillar" to mean "pillow," and when I asked how God led these people, who had never been out of Egypt so far before, one of them replied, "By a *yellow cushion*, which showed them the way." And another added, "It was yellow on one side and black on the other." It took me a few seconds to see the steps in the syllogism which had led to this absurd conclusion. I began a most cautious presentation of my lesson truth, avoiding the word "pillar," using "bright could" and "dark cloud," and describing it as reaching from far up in the sky down to the very ground,—my central

lesson being that those who were doing right were in the brightness of God's loving care, and enjoying His smile of approval. For home work I suggested that they draw a cloud with crayons, making half of bright crayon and half of black, and that they put some marks for people on the bright side of the cloud—as many people as they saw doing kind, loving things that week, which showed that they were living in the brightness of God's smile and following His leading. The home work came back, and, to my dismay, every one of those who had gotten that first idea of a "yellow cushion" (but only those few) had drawn a square sofa-pillow, orange on one side and black on the other.'

A new Life of Channing has been written, and Dr. Edward Everett Hale reviews it in *The American Journal of Theology* for January. Or rather, he gossips about it. What he does review is Calvinism, and of that his verdict is short and emphatic. 'But it is hardly worth while,' he says, 'to refer to such passages of a century ago. Calvinism has gone to its own place now. There are a few who do it reverence in a Pickwickian fashion, but practically the fatherhood of God is sought everywhere, and the children of God are awaking to their privileges and their duties.'

And then, in his inconsequential way, he ends his review thus—

Knowing and Doing.—Hero-worship is a very good thing, but hero-worship is not everything. Is it perhaps the greatest thing of all to speak for one's time—to be enough ahead of it to lead men where they falter or are afraid, not to be so far from it that they cannot hear one sound or other appeal? We despise Erasmus because, while he knew so much, he did so little. We are grateful to Luther because he did so much when he knew so little.

Who dares think one thing and another tell
My heart detests him as the gates of hell.

There is no more sincere or persistent opponent of Agnosticism than Dr. Paul Carus, of whose philosophy some account is given on another page. In *The Open Court* for January he writes a letter on the subject to Mr. Persifor Frazer:—

Agnosticism.—There are two kinds of agnosticism: one is the agnosticism of modesty; the other, absolute agnosticism. The former is a temporary suspension of judgment, the latter a belief in perpetual nescience. The former is not agnosticism proper, but is the natural attitude of a man who does not dogmatize on a subject which he has not yet investigated. The latter is a declaration of bankruptcy, and it acts as a blight on thought.

Agnosticism is an important epoch in the history of philosophic thought, but it is so inconsistent and untenable that even now it is fast dying out, and will have to be regarded by the historian merely as a phase of transition.

St. Luke's Passion-Narrative considered with Reference to the Synoptic Problem.

By THE REV. CANON SIR JOHN C. HAWKINS, BART., M.A., OXFORD.

II.

It was shown in the former part of this article (p. 122 ff.) that St. Luke deals very much more freely than St. Matthew with the portion of St. Mark's Gospel which forms the foundation of both their Passion-narratives. But perhaps it may be said that there is nothing very surprising or unaccountable in two writers being led by their personal idiosyncrasies, or by the special objects of their literary works, to utilize with very different degrees of closeness a source which lay before them both. Admitting the fact, we may not unreasonably be content to leave it without explanation. But we pass now to what does most certainly call for explanation. We shall see that Luke's free treatment of the Marcan document in his Passion-narrative (22¹⁴-24¹⁰) is very strikingly *different from his own treatment of it* in very nearly all the other portions of his Gospel which have any appearance of being grounded on Mark. I say in very nearly all those portions, not in quite all of them; for both Matthew's and Luke's narratives of the Baptist's preaching and of the Temptation, though they stand in parallel places to Mark's, and though they embody some matter that seems to be Marcan, contain also a large amount of matter that is not found in Mark. The causes of this cannot be fully discussed here: it may be said, however, as to the Baptist-narrative that there is considerable reason for thinking that there, and probably there only, some of the original Marcan or Petrine matter may have been omitted from our present Mark (so Woods in *Studia Biblica*, ii. 85, 91, 94; cf. Stanton in *Ency. Brit.* xxix. 41); while of the Temptation-narrative we can only say that in this case the details which the two compilers found in their (? Logian) source happened to be very much larger in quantity than the slight Marcan framework, from which but 13 words are preserved wholly or in part by Matthew, and but 12 by Luke.

i. But let us pass beyond those two more or less preliminary sections, and examine Luke's records of our Lord's actual ministry, from Lk 4¹⁴ = Mk 1¹⁴ = Mt 4¹² onwards, so far as they are based on Mark, with a view to comparing them with his Passion-

narrative. And first let us apply to them that mechanical and verbal kind of examination with which we commenced our comparison between Matthew's and Luke's Passion-narratives. Now Luke's Ministry-narratives which concern us now, consist of 311 verses, which are contained in five sections of the Gospel, namely, Lk 4⁸¹⁻⁴⁴ 5¹²⁻⁶¹⁹ 8⁴⁻⁹⁵¹ 18¹⁵⁻⁴⁸ 19²⁹⁻²²¹³ (I have omitted some single verses such as 4¹⁴ as being negligible quantities, and I have excluded 4¹⁵⁻³⁰ and 5¹⁻¹¹ as apparently resting upon non-Markan sources, and being but slightly influenced by Mk 6¹⁻⁶ and 1¹⁶⁻²⁰). Those 311 verses contain 5320 words, of which no less than 2829, being rather more than half of them or about 53 per cent., are also found either wholly or in part in Mark. It should be mentioned in passing that the case is almost the same in Matthew; for those parts of the First Gospel, extending over 477 verses, which refer to the ministry of Jesus and which appear to be founded on the Marcan source, contain 8180 words, of which 4173, being a very little more than half, or about 51 per cent., occur either wholly or partially in Mark, so that Matthew adheres to that source to almost exactly the same extent when he is using it with reference to the Ministry and when he is using it with reference to the Passion. But the case is very different as to Luke, with whom we are now concerned: *his* procedure varies very greatly in these two departments of his Gospel. As has just been shown, more than half the words in those five portions of his Ministry-narrative which have a Marcan basis are also found, either entirely or partially, in our present Mark; and it may be added that when we examine those five portions separately, in none of them does the proportion fall below one-half, except very slightly in Lk 4⁸¹⁻⁴⁴ (where the numbers are 126 and 263), while in 18¹⁵⁻⁴⁸ it rises as high as two-thirds (being 291 words out of 424). How great then is the contrast when we turn to Luke's Passion-narrative, in which we have found (p. 123) that very little more than a quarter of the words (namely, 507 out of 1906) are wholly or in part identical with words found in Mark. In other words, *the verbal correspondence with the*

Marcan source is about twice as great in the Lucan account of the Ministry as it is in the Lucan account of the Passion; and that, as it happens, is almost exactly the same amount of disparity as we found to exist between the Lucan and the Matthæan Passion-narratives when we compared them from this same point of view.

ii. If we turn from the wording to the substance of the two departments of Luke which we are engaged in comparing, we shall find that the *additions to our knowledge* are considerably less important and less numerous in the Ministry-narrative than in the Passion-narrative, although the former contains 311 verses and the latter only 123. (It must be borne in mind throughout that we are only concerned with those portions of the Ministry-narrative which appear to be founded on Mark and not with the large insertions made from other sources, such as Lk 19¹⁻²⁸, besides others already referred to.) In the 311 verses of the Ministry-narrative, there are of course not a few short additions to, and variations from, Mark; but in the great majority of cases these are either (*a*) derived from or suggested by the context, or (*b*) they are the results of Luke's special idiosyncrasies and interests, or (*c*) they are such as an evangelist might naturally supply as the result of his general knowledge of the habitual tone of the life of Jesus, for instance, the constant recourse to prayer (as in 5¹⁶ 6¹² 9^{18, 28}), or again (*d*) as the result of his general knowledge of the impression made by the Lord's teaching and miracles (as in 6¹¹ 9⁴³ 13³⁴ (= 9⁴⁵) 43 19³⁷ 20^{26, 39}). But to examine and classify all the small Lucan additions would be out of place here; I would mention, however, that in doing so Mr. Wright's edition of *St. Luke's Gospel in Greek*, in which he brackets the apparently 'editorial supplements,' is particularly helpful; and I may refer to some references collected in *Horæ Synopticæ*, p. 158 ff. The point before us now is that these small additions do not often contain any substantially new matter, such as would require the hypothesis of a non-Marcan source to account for it. Such really new matter does not seem to me to constitute more than about 17 entire verses, namely, Lk 5³⁹ 9^{31, 32} 19³⁹⁻⁴⁴ 20¹⁸ 21^{18, 22, 24, 28, 34-36}, besides a few short sentences (such as 21^{11b}) and phrases, and single words. It will be observed that a very large proportion of this new matter is contained in Luke's version of the Prophecy on the Mount in chap. 21,

and seems to be mainly caused (*a*) by the use of Pauline language as in vv. 24, 28, 34-36 (cf. also v. 18 with Ac 27³⁴), and (*b*) by Luke's knowledge of the events by which the prophecy had been fulfilled before he wrote, as in vv. 11, 20, 24 (and so also in 19^{43f.}).

But the much shorter Passion-narrative of Luke has been shown (see p. 123) to contain a much larger amount of new matter, namely, about 33 verses and 3 half-verses, besides some more brief and fragmentary additions to our knowledge. Thus it appears that the later of these two departments of Luke which we are comparing, though it extends to only two-fifths of the length of the earlier one (123 verses against 311), contains *nearly twice as much matter*, which seems to imply the use of an additional source or sources besides the Marcan one.

This second contrast, though less capable of clear and incontrovertible statement than those which I place first and third, points in the same direction as they do; for it shows that from Lk 22¹⁴ to 24¹⁰ the evangelist was more ready, or more able, than he had previously been to supplement his Marcan source, not merely with editorial comments and amplifications, but with fresh information.

iii. It will be remembered that the third point of contrast between the Matthæan and the Lucan Passion-narratives lay in the fact that while Luke twelve times transposes the Marcan order, Matthew never does so; and it was pointed out that such transpositions are particularly worthy of notice, because the freedom which they show is so specially symptomatic of oral use of a source, while on the other hand they are the kind of alterations which a copyist is very unlikely to make, however inaccurate he may be in the way of alteration and of omission. Now the occurrence of such changes of order, though not completely absent from Luke's Ministry-narrative, occurs with much greater frequency in his Passion-narrative. For in those 311 verses of the former, which we are now concerned with as being based on Mark, I can find but seven variations from the Marcan order, namely, those which may be seen in—

1.	Lk	6 ¹²⁻¹⁹	compared with Mk	3 ^{7-19a} .
2.	"	8 ²³	" " "	4 ^{37, 38} .
3.	"	8 ^{28, 29}	" " "	5 ⁸⁻⁸ .
4.	"	8 ⁴²	" " "	5 ⁴² .
5.	"	8 ^{55b, 56}	" " "	5 ^{42b, 43} .
6.	"	9 ^{14a} .	" " "	6 ⁴⁴ .
7.	"	20 ¹⁵	" " "	12 ⁸ .

The different placing of the coming of the mother and brethren in Lk 8¹⁹⁻²¹ and in Mk 3³¹⁻³⁵ is not included in this list, because, as is shown in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, xiv. 139b, a change of that incident from its Marcan position was necessitated by Luke's omission here of the discourse to which it is appended in Mark.

Of the above seven instances only the first has any intrinsic importance, and there no doubt the transposition of the substance of Mk 3⁷⁻¹² and 18-19^a was intentionally made by Luke, in order to provide an introduction to his Sermon on the Plain. The other six are trifling alterations of order, which make no difference to our understanding of the narrative, and which therefore no copyist would have been likely to care to make designedly.

Now if the 123 verses of Luke's Passion-narrative contained inversions of Mark's order in the same proportion as the 311 verses of his Ministry-narrative, to which we have now been referring, there would of course only be three such inversions. But we have seen that as a fact there are twelve (see the list of them in the former part of this article, p. 124 f.). In other words, Luke avails himself of the liberty of transposition *four times as freely* in his Passion-narrative as he does in those narratives of the ministry which are founded upon the same source.

Such are the facts of the case. How are they to be accounted for? How came Luke in his Passion-narrative to deal so freely with his fundamental source, thus differing so remarkably in these respects both from the procedure of Matthew and also from his own procedure in earlier parts of his Gospel?

The well-known theory of Feine and others (see Dr. Sanday in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, xi. 473), that Luke had before him some kind of record, or early Gospel, which he used as a third source in addition to, and frequently in preference to, Mark and the *Logia*, at once suggests itself. And I used to think that the strongest arguments in favour of that theory were to be found in his Passion-narrative. But the closer investigation, of which I have been here summarizing the results, has impressed upon me that such a 'three-document hypothesis,' as it may be called, does not give much help towards the interpretation of the phenomena here presented to us. Luke's additions are (unlike Matthew's) so mixed up with the *Grundskrift*, and

they have caused alterations and modifications of such kinds, that they suggest a long and gradual conflation in the mind rather than a simple conflation by the pen.

It seems then that more probability would attach to a hypothesis that would represent our author as having been accustomed to make oral use of the materials which he embodies in this part of his Gospel. Now it is something more than a hypothesis, it is the subject of a direct statement on the generally accepted Epistle of Philemon (v.²⁴), supported by other evidence both external and internal, that St. Luke was a 'fellow-worker' with St. Paul. And if so, he will have been a preacher of Christianity after the Pauline type, and will have been mainly occupied with the Pauline range of subjects. And that range of subjects, so far as we can judge of it from the apostle's extant Epistles—whether we accept more or fewer of them—and also from the brief reports of his speeches in the Acts, seems to have coincided to a remarkable extent with the matter which we have been considering in Luke's Passion-narrative. For (1) certainly St. Paul's references to the teachings of the Lord during His ministry are much fewer than we should have expected, though sayings are referred to as His in 1 Co 7¹⁰ 9¹⁴, perhaps in 1 Ti 5¹⁸, possibly in 1 Th 4¹⁵, and though we find close similarities to His teachings in Ro 12^{14, 17} 16¹⁹, 1 Co 13², 1 Th 5², 2 Th 3³, 2 Ti 2¹², and though in 1 Ti 6⁸ 'the words of our Lord Jesus Christ' are referred to generally as the standard of sound doctrine. And (2) to the acts, including the miracles, of the earlier and ministerial life of Jesus, there are no Pauline references at all either in letters or speeches; for what has been sometimes thought the suspicious similarity between the speeches of Peter and Paul in Acts does not extend to this point, there being no Pauline parallels to Ac 2²² and 10³⁸. 'The Gospel which' Paul 'preached,' and wherein he would have his converts 'stand,' appears, so far as we can judge from his references to that preaching, to have rested upon the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ as being 'the events instrumental in salvation, the foundation of the new order of grace.' So Wendt well expresses it, where he is pointing out the difference between the predominant aspect of faith in the Pauline Epistles and that in the Johannine discourses, since in the latter belief 'means acceptance of the words of

Jesus and observance of His commandments' (*The Gospel of St. John*, p. 198 f., E.T.).¹

Thus the Pauline preaching, as contrasted with the substance either of the first three Gospels or of the Fourth, must have been concerned mainly with the Crucifixion and the Resurrection, so far as it consisted in setting forth facts. But as to the Resurrection as a fact there could not be much to say in detail, however important it was as a foundation of doctrine; for the event itself was an invisible one, and the proofs of it would not require repetition, except when doubt or disbelief arose as at Corinth (1 Co 15¹²). And so the Crucifixion would be thrown into unique prominence as a constant subject of preaching. And accordingly we find St. Paul saying emphatically of himself and his fellow-workers, 'We preach Christ crucified' (1 Co 1²³; cf. v. 17 and 2²).

Now, if this was the case, the story of the Crucifixion, and of the Passion as leading up to the Crucifixion, must have had an intense interest for Christians of the Pauline type. Details about those last days at Jerusalem would be longed for and begged for by them; and, if not St. Paul himself, at least other catechists and teachers such as St. Luke would take pains in order to supply such details, so far as they could gather them, directly or indirectly, from 'eye-witnesses and ministers of the word.' May it not have been thus that the preacher (and perhaps catechist) who afterwards became the Third Evangelist, had for his homiletic purposes gradually supplemented, and in supplementing had to some extent modified and transposed, the generally accepted Marcan record, so far as it related to the Passion and Crucifixion? And so, when he came to this part of his Gospel, he would write down the memories of his past teaching which were impressed upon his mind, without having much occasion to make direct reference to the Marcan source, as he himself had done in describing those earlier parts of the life of Jesus which were less familiar to him, and as the compiler of the First Gospel did in his Passion-narrative as much as in his Ministry-narrative.

Two observations may be added in support of the above suggestion that in 22¹⁴-24¹⁰ Luke may be writing down the substance of what he had spoken as a 'fellow-worker' of St. Paul in preaching.

¹ See also Menzies, *The Earliest Gospel*, p. 6 ff.

1. The portion of his Gospel which we have found to be characterized by such peculiar freedom in the use of Mark commences with the institution of the Lord's Supper (the next preceding verses having been, as it happens, in unusually close agreement with the Marcan source). Now that incident is also recorded by St. Paul himself (1 Co 11²³⁻²⁵), and indeed it forms the only exception to his silence as to the acts of Jesus which preceded the actual Passion.

2. If we glance at the subjects of Luke's insertions so far as they contain new matter, they seem to be generally of such a kind as would be attractive and interesting when used in preaching. Here again, as in the previous part of this article (see p. 124), it is instructive to contrast them in pages 195 f. and 227 ff. of *Synopticon*, or otherwise, with Matthew's insertions of new matter. As to the latter, I do not dwell now upon the remarkable number of difficulties which happen to be suggested by many of them: I only point out that referring as they do very largely to Judas and to Pilate, they offer but little material for instruction as to 'the mind which was in Christ Jesus' when He suffered and died. In proof of this remark, let any preacher of experience, after recalling the two lists of additions made by the First and Third Evangelists respectively, ask himself how often he has made use of the Matthean additions in comparison with those made by Luke—such as the fuller warning to Simon (22³¹⁻³²), the address to the women of Jerusalem (23²⁷⁻³¹), the story of the penitent robber (23³⁹⁻⁴³)? Of course the contrast must not be made too much of: we have two sayings from the Cross in Mt and Mk to set against the two found in Lk only (if we accept as Lucan 23^{34a} as well as 23⁴⁶); and Luke's longest insertion, that relating to the appearance before Herod, must be admitted to have been made by him with no homiletic purpose, but to have been a result of his special interest in, and perhaps connexion with, the Herodian family and household (Lk 3¹ 8³ 24¹⁰, Ac 13¹). But still the contrast does to some extent exist; and so far as it is recognized, it will add some probability to the conjecture—for it is no more than a conjecture—which has been here put forward to account for the special characteristics of St. Luke's Passion-narrative.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

ACTS IX. 3-6.

'And as he journeyed, it came to pass that he drew nigh unto Damascus: and suddenly there shone round about him a light out of heaven: and he fell upon the earth, and heard a voice saying unto him, Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me? And he said, Who art thou, Lord? And he said, I am Jesus whom thou persecutest: but rise, and enter into the city, and it shall be told thee what thou must do.'—R.V.

EXPOSITION.

'And as he journeyed, it came to pass that he drew nigh unto Damascus.'—Damascus was about 150 miles N.E. of Jerusalem, one of the oldest cities in the world, situated in a singularly fertile plain watered by the Barada. At this time it was in the possession of Aretas, an Arabian prince, tributary to the Romans, who may have been favourable to Jewish authority.—PAGE.

'And suddenly there shone round about him a light out of heaven.'—(περίστραψεν φῶς). περίστ. indicates that the light flashed about him suddenly and unexpectedly like lightning.—PAGE.

'And he fell upon the earth.'—If he were not on foot, this was in all likelihood from the back of a camel, not of a horse as the painters have usually represented it.—COOK.

'And heard a voice saying unto him, Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?'—Shaûl, Shaûl, the Hebrew form of the word. This repetition always carries with it warning or reproach in St. Luke: Martha, Martha; Jerusalem, Jerusalem; Simon, Simon.—RACKHAM.

'Me.'—Jesus identifies Himself with His followers.—PAGE.

'And he said, Who art thou, Lord.'—A cry of reverence toward the heavenly Speaker, without any clear notion as to the medium through whom the Voice of God was uttered.—BARTLET.

'And He said, I am Jesus whom thou persecutest.'—ἐγώ . . . σὺ, very emphatic antithesis, lost in English.—PAGE.

WHAT was said by our Lord is, according to the best critical evidence, limited to, 'I am Jesus whom thou persecutest. But arise,' etc. The clauses, 'It is hard . . . said unto him,' have no MS. authority, uncial or cursive, and are not represented in Syr. in this context. They must be regarded as an interpolation here from 26th, where they are unquestionably genuine.—COOK.

'But rise, and enter into the city, and it shall be told thee what thou must do.'—He was not yet prepared for the full revelation of his duty. It takes time for the new thoughts and purposes to become calm and clear, for his decisions to mature. The experience of mature Christians can be a great help to one inquiring the way. Such was Evangelist to Bunyan's Christian.—PELOUBET.

THE SERMON.

The Conversion of Paul an argument for Christianity.

By the Rev. H. C. Williams.

No one who knows anything of Paul can doubt the radical change his conversion made on his life. Let us look briefly at his conversion then, and see if we cannot find in it an argument for Christianity.

1. *Christianity convinces the intellect.*—Since the world was, there has probably never been a man with a stronger intellect than Paul's. If we think of his powers of reasoning, of his exhaustive knowledge, of his clear judgment, and of his vivid imagination, we are amazed, and we pronounce him a real master mind. Neither was Paul ignorant, he was 'instructed according to the strict manner of the law of our fathers.' Yet this man with the splendid intellect and good education was convinced of the truth of Christianity. He knew that Christ had risen and had appeared unto him, and because of this certainty he gave up his position and threw in his lot with the persecuted Nazarenes. Christianity is no doctrine to be taken on trust—it will emerge triumphant from the investigation of the most learned. It appeals to the educated as well as to the ignorant mind.

2. *Christianity satisfies the conscience.*—When Paul started for Damascus his conscience was not at rest. His share in the martyrdom of Stephen was troubling him. To get relief from his conscience he became still more bitter in his persecutions. In that long lonely journey to Damascus he probably realized that his added anguish was not going to give him peace. The pangs of conscience made themselves felt. Then it was that he heard the voice of Jesus speaking tenderly to him, and 'the peace which passeth understanding entered in, and took possession of his entire self.'

3. *Christianity subdues the will.*—'Man is a self-conscious being.' He possesses a will, he can choose between good and evil. Unless Christianity subdues that will it has effected nothing. The preaching of Christ may enlighten the understanding of the listeners, so that they give a

formal assent to the facts of the gospel, it may even stir their emotions, yet it has accomplished nothing if their will is not conquered and their lives changed. There has never been a man with a more stubborn will than Paul, yet he became the slave of Jesus Christ—laying all his energies and powers at His feet.

4. *Christianity commands the life.*—When God redeems man He does not annihilate his faculties, He transfers them to a higher service. Paul's first question after his conversion was, 'Lord, what wilt thou have me to *do*?' Nor did Christ disdain to use him, persecutor though he had been, He replied, 'Rise, and enter into the city, . . .' Conversion is not the end, it is only the beginning of life.

Reverence—'Who art thou, Lord?'

By Bishop A. W. Thorold, D.D.

It has been said that three qualities are necessary to make a perfect character. One of these is reverence. 'Reverence is the habitual, almost instinctive, recognition of a goodness which it cannot emulate; of a wisdom which it cannot fathom; of an almighty power which fills the soul with unspeakable awe, yet of a love which in its inexpressible tenderness passeth knowledge—

Let knowledge grow from more to more,
But more of reverence in us dwell.

The scope of reverence is fourfold; in our daily common life; in the doing of Christian service; in the enduring of trouble; in the offering of worship.

In our daily life, with its troubles small and great, nothing helps us so much as the sense of the near presence of God. If we have this thought constantly with us, though on earth, we are already in the 'City of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem.' In our service also we are strengthened and encouraged by the thought that the Master's eye is ever upon us; that He has given us the work and will pay us our wages. That He knows how hard the work is, and how great were the difficulties we encountered doing it. In our troubles and in our illnesses, when we are tempted to despair and say, 'What is it we have done that we are so sorely punished,' reverence comes to our aid and helps us to see God all round us, clasping us in His everlasting arms. In our worship, too, how necessary is reverence. Without it our prayer and praise is

void. By reverence, of course, we do not mean ostentatious bodily reverence; rather a lowly spirit, a meek and contrite heart.

There is, however, another kind of reverence, namely, reverence of self. Do not let us think lightly of the man for whom Jesus gave up His life. Let us value ourselves highly since we 'are the temple of God, and the spirit of the Lord dwelleth' in us. This reverence will not only be for ourselves, it will also be for others; for the poor, and for the sorrowful and the sinful. 'Such were some of you, but ye are washed, ye are justified, ye are sanctified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God.'

Three Glimpses of Christ.

By the Rev. Ebenezer Morgan.

It has been said that the three greatest events that have happened in the world are the Incarnation, Pentecost, and the Conversion of Paul. So important is the latter that St. Luke has included three separate accounts of it in the Acts of the Apostles.

In the Conversion of St. Paul we have three glimpses of Jesus.

1. *The Reality of His Resurrection.*—Lord Lyttelton being fully persuaded that Christianity and Christ were impostures, decided to choose some seemingly miraculous occurrence in the New Testament, study it, and then expose it. What he chose was the Conversion of Paul. But Lord Lyttelton, after much study and painful research, was compelled to acknowledge that he could not disprove it. It was true. Paul himself, we know, never doubted that it was actually the risen Christ who spoke to him that day. If he had doubted it, would he ever have been able to undergo sufferings, trials, and persecutions?

He tells us that 'last of all, as unto one born out of due time, He appeared unto me also.' It has been suggested that Paul was the victim of a hallucination; it has even been suggested that he suffered from an epileptic fit. But surely these solutions are impossible. Paul's vision was not only the occurrence of a moment; it left its traces. For three days he was blind. Many years afterwards he could tell to the most minute detail what happened in those three days. He was under the influence of no epileptic fit. His mind—that mind which was trained by Gamaliel—was alive

and active, and could not be deceived. He knew what he had seen. 'But Saul . . . confounded the Jews which dwelt at Damascus, *proving* that this is the Christ.'

2. *His Identification with His Tried and Faithful Followers.*—Christ's question to Paul was not, 'Why persecutest thou them?' but 'Why persecutest thou *Me*?' If the humblest member of Christ's mystical body suffers, then 'at once the Head suffers, by the subtle yet potent influence of spiritual sympathy.'

He in the days of feeble flesh
Poured out His cries and tears,
And, though exalted, feels afresh
What every member bears.

It is true, however, that if Christ feels every injury done to His people, He also feels every kindness. 'Inasmuch as ye did it unto one of these my brethren, ye did it unto me.'

3. *The Greatness of His Saving Power.*—Saul of Tarsus was a Pharisee, nay he was more: he belonged to the strictest sect of the Pharisees. He was educated by Gamaliel. He was a member of the Sanhedrin. Of all sects that have ever existed, the Pharisees were the most difficult to save, because they were so sure that they required no saving. But Jesus Christ was able to save even Paul, so how could Paul doubt His ability to save others?

Paul speaking of himself said, 'sinners of whom I am chief.'

'Wherefore he is able to save to the uttermost them that draw near unto God by Him.'

ILLUSTRATIONS.

WHOSE is that sword—that voice and eye of flame—
That heart of inextinguishable ire?
Who bears the dungeon keys, and bonds, and fire?
Along his dark and withering path he came—
Death in his looks and terror in his name,
Tempting the might of heaven's eternal sire.
Lo! the light shone! the sun's veiled beams expire—
Whose is yon form, stretched on the earth's cold bed,
With smitten soul and tears of agony,
Mourning the past? Bowed is the lofty head—
Rayless the orbs that flashed with victory,
Over the raging waves of human will
The Saviour's spirit walked—and all was still.

THOMAS ROSCOE.

The Way to Damascus.—We do not know the precise spot where Paul's conversion occurred, but tradition localizes it as Salahiye, an outer spur of the Lebanon range, at the foot of huge limestone cliffs, where the traveller first catches sight of the boundless plain and the magnificent city of Damascus set in the midst of it. Here they say Abraham

had the unity of God revealed to him. One moment the famished eye sees on every side nothing but the grey aridity of limestone rock, without a leaf to enliven it; and the next it gazes enraptured upon an ocean of infinitely varied foliage. Mahomet in after years, it is said, captivated by the sight, declined to go farther than this spot, declaring that, as there was but one paradise, his should not be in this world. To this storied spot came the Patriarch Abraham, in fulfilment of the Divine command which summoned him to go *into* the Land of Promise, that he might be there the father of the chosen people, educated under God's own eye to become the missionaries of mankind. To that storied spot came the apostle, in fulfilment of the Divine command which summoned him to go *out* of the Land of Promise, and preach the results of the special training of the chosen race to all nations.—HUGH MACMILLAN.

Nigh unto Damascus.—As in the case of Paul, so often in the dealings of His providence and grace, God allows matters to go very far without interfering; and the reason for the delay will be found to be as satisfactory, if searched out in all such cases, as it was in Paul's experience. The apples of Palestine are far inferior to those of England, because the heat of the climate brings them too soon to maturity; and no one who has eaten the almost tasteless hastily-grown strawberries of Italy will compare them with those of Northern lands, in which the slow patience of the favouring heavens has stored up a rich piquancy of flavour. Forced fruits and vegetables have never the qualities of those which are allowed to await their own proper season of ripening. The century's sleep of the aloe is followed by a sudden floral development that is colossal, commensurate with the long period that it took to flower.—HUGH MACMILLAN.

Conversion as Psychology.—Knowing that numerous backslidings and relapses take place, some dismiss abrupt conversions with a pitying smile as so much 'hysterics.' Psychologically, as well as religiously, however, this is shallow. It misses the point of serious interest, which is not so much the duration as the nature and quality of these shiftings of character to higher levels. Men lapse from every level—we need no statistics to tell us that. So with the conversion experience: that it should for even a short time show a human being what the high-water mark of his spiritual capacity is, this is what constitutes its importance—an importance which backsliding cannot diminish, although persistence might increase it. As a matter of fact, all the more striking instances of conversion have been permanent.—WILLIAM JAMES.

Why persecutest thou Me?—An English ship was once in Constantinople harbour. When the British flag was observed, the Sultan himself, who resides only about a mile from the city, sent special instructions that the passengers and the crew were to be guarded. Critical negotiations were in progress at the time between him and the Foreign Office of Great Britain, and he knew that any insult to the English ship would be resented by the Government of the Queen as a personal affront to Her Majesty. On the other hand, the kindness of the French peasants to the survivors from the shipwreck of the *Drummond Castle* was acknowledged by the Queen in a beautiful letter and by medals and in other

ways, as if their kindness to her subjects in distress was taken as deeds of love to Her Majesty.—E. MORGAN.

What wilt Thou have me to do?—In the year 1752 Benjamin Franklin made the discovery of the identity of lightning with the electric fluid. His object was to prove that it was practicable to prevent this powerful agent from being destructive to life and property, and he was fortunate enough to invent the lightning conductor. But it is a far greater triumph for the scientists of a later age to harness the lightning in the service of mankind, so that it sends a message to the farthest ends of the globe in a few seconds. We have in this an illustration of the work of the gospel in the world. It is not enough to be able to induce the drunkard to forsake his cup, and to win the man of evil tongue from his wicked words, it is also necessary to get them to see true happiness in holy living, and in praising God both in conduct and in word.—H. C. WILLIAMS.

WHY, Lord, this twofold glory of Thy ray,
Giving him sight whose sight it takes away?
Paul in that night God's inner light shall find:
That he may see the Christ his eyes are blind.
RICHARD CRAWSHAW.

FOR REFERENCE.

- Alford (H.), *Homilies on Acts*, 277.
Barry (A.), *Sermons preached at Westminster*, 279.
Benson (R. M.), *The Final Passover*, 656.
Brooks (P.), *The Law of Growth*, 184.
Campbell (J. M.), *Bible Questions*, 105.
Coates (G.), *The Morning Watch for Soldiers of the King*, 259.
Ingram (W. C.), *Happiness in the Spiritual Life*, 45.
Knight (J. J.), *Sermons in Brief*, 56.
Laing (F. A.), *Bible Lessons for Children*, 304.
Macmillan (H.), *Gleanings in Holy Fields*, 101.
Morgan (E.), *Calls of God*, 331.
Morison (J.), *Sheaves of Ministry*, 212.
Spurgeon (C. H.), *Gospel for the People*, 24.
Stanley (A. P.), *Sermons in the East*, 63.
Stier (R.), *Words of the Risen Saviour*, 9.
Sturrock (J. B.), *Our Present Hope and our Future Home*, 32.
Thompson (H.), *Concionalia, Outlines of Sermons*, vol. ii. 48.
Thorold (A. W.), *Questions of Faith and Duty*, 305.
Wells (J.), *Bible Images for the Young*, 47.
Williams (H. C.), *Christ the Centre*, 16.

Recent Biblical and Oriental Archaeology.

BY PROFESSOR A. H. SAYCE, D.D., OXFORD.

Were there Hittites in Southern Palestine?

THE question has again been raised as to whether the Benê-Khêth from whom Abraham bought the cave of Machpelah are to be identified with the Hittites of northern Syria. The progress of knowledge is so rapid that although my discovery of the ethnic relationship and importance of these northern Hittites and their art is hardly twenty-five years old, it is likely to be forgotten by the younger scholars of to-day, who accept the fact as self-evident, and it is still more likely to be forgotten that although historians, like Eduard Meyer, accepted the discovery at once, I had a long contest to maintain before I could get it generally admitted in this country. And yet the same principles of reasoning which led me to 'discover' the Hittites of Asia Minor and Syria led me also to the belief that the Benê-Khêth of Hebron were really a branch of the Hittite race. The question, in fact, like all other questions of Old Testament history, is one which must be settled by archæology and not by philology.

My chief reason for believing that there were Hittites in southern Palestine was the statement of Ezekiel that such was the case. According to Ezekiel (16^{3, 45}) the founders of Jerusalem were primarily Amorites and secondarily Hittites. Long before I found the name of Urusalim, or Jerusalem, in the Tel el-Amarna tablets and pointed it out to my brother Assyriologists, I had maintained against my critical adversaries that the name of Jerusalem was older than the age of the Exodus, and that the city was already an important one in the time of Abraham. I had also prophesied that a library of clay books might be discovered there, similar to the clay libraries of Babylonia, if only we could dig deeply enough, and that, at any rate, as the city was not destroyed by the Israelites (Jos 15⁶³ and Jg 1²¹), its early records, written on imperishable clay, could easily have been handed down to the contemporaries of Ezekiel. I recall all this, not in order to claim superior prevision and insight, but in order to show that if we wish to search for historical truth it is better to follow the leading of archæology than of grammatical analysis. The conclusions at which I arrived might have been

arrived at by any one else who had a smattering of archaeological knowledge and a little common sense.

Now these conclusions were indissolubly bound up with the conclusion that there were Hittites in the south of Palestine. And this latter conclusion was further supported by the ethnographical lists given in the Pentateuch in which the Hittites appear among the inhabitants of Canaan. In Gn 10 Heth—not 'the Hittite,' be it observed—heads the list after Zidon, and is conjoined with 'the Jebusite.' The fact must be specially noted, as the list not only takes us back to the Tel el-Amarna age, after which 'the Arkite' and 'Zemarite' specified in it disappear from history, while Tyre and other cities or tribes take their place, but with the exception of the Jebusite and perhaps the Hittite it is confined to the states and populations of the north. 'Hivite' may be a descriptive rather than an ethnic name—at all events, it is not met with farther south than Shechem and Gibeon—and the land of the Amorites, as we learn from the Tel el-Amarna tablets, was properly immediately to the north of Palestine. But from a very early age the Babylonians had included the whole population of Canaan under the general term 'Amorite,' and in the Pentateuch the old Babylonian practice (which ceased after the beginning of the Assyrian period and the Hittite conquerors in Syria) is usually followed. So it is also by Ezekiel. The list in Gn 10 must thus have been compiled by a writer to whom the Babylonian practice and the actual geographical position occupied in the Tel el-Amarna age by the peoples he mentions must have been equally well known. The fact, therefore, that he couples the Hittites with the Jebusites of Jerusalem is at least worthy of attention.

Elsewhere (Gn 15¹⁹⁻²¹, Ex 33², etc.) the Hittites are included among other populations of southern Palestine, their territory is promised to the descendants of Abraham, and they are to be driven out by the invading Israelites. This was never true of the northern Hittites, and no Hebrew writer could ever have supposed it to be true of them. The reference must consequently be to some other Hittites who were associated with the native tribes of the south. The biblical writers to whom the ethnographical lists are due must therefore have identified the Benê-Khêth of Hebron with the Hittites, but as the Jebusites are also mentioned in the lists, they can hardly have been

meant to be, as in Ezekiel, the Hittites who were inhabitants of Jerusalem.

The name of the Benê-Khêth cannot be separated from the Heth of Gn 10. Its substitution for the more ordinary 'Hittite' and 'Hittites' is one of those 'undesigned coincidences' which have a particular value in the eyes of the archaeologist. The Hittites, we now know, deified their tribes and cities. At Boghaz Keui the goddesses wear mural crowns, and Khattu, or 'Heth,' 'the Hittite,' was not only the name of the nation, but also of the national god. Hence came the proper name Khattu-sar, 'Khattu (the Hittite) is king,' like Quai-sar, 'Quê (Cilicia) is king,' or Khilpa-sar, 'Aleppo is king.'¹ My decipherment of the Hittite inscriptions has added other examples to the list. Katu, for instance, was a god, as well as 'the Cataonian'; the mother of Sandes is called 'the divine daughter of Carchemish'; and, as among the Babylonians, Amurru was at once 'the Amorite' and 'the Amorite god.' Similarly Stephanus of Byzantium tells us that the cities of Adana, Ostasos, and Olymbros were Cilician deities, the offspring of Heaven and Earth. Earth, called Amma or Ammes in the Hittite texts, was itself divine, and 'the nine great gods' of one Hittite inscription became 'the nine sacred cities' in another. The chief Hittite cities, in fact, were 'sacred cities,' in each of which a triangular stone symbolized and contained the deity. It is these sacred stones, and not an image, that the Hittite priest-kings describe themselves as setting up and restoring.²

Heth, accordingly, was the deified Hittite race, whose children were the Hittites themselves. Its use in the ethnographical table of Genesis is strictly correct, and there is no need of seeing in Benê-Khêth some other and unknown name. In archaeology, as in other sciences, where a known cause is available, we are not permitted to invoke an unknown one.

But archaeology, like other sciences, cannot admit that a result has any scientific value unless it is established by the method of comparison. And we cannot compare a thing with itself. If we

¹ Here I follow the usual interpretation, but the name may just as well be read Khirpa-sar, 'Herpa is king.'

² Thus Aimgalas (Mugalla, the Greek 'Αμγάλας), the priest-king of Tyana, states that he 'built anew the sacred stone of Sandes of the city of the Eneti as it was before,' and a king of Carchemish whose name is lost similarly says: 'Behold the sacred stone of the city as it was before [anew I set up].'

wish to attain to scientific results, we must have something else with which to compare it.

As long as the Book of Genesis stood isolated and alone, a really scientific examination of its contents was impossible. But its isolation is a thing of the past. Thanks to archæological discovery, the civilized world of Genesis is becoming fairly well known to us, and the means for testing the value and signification of its narratives are being put into our hands. We can now read the pages of the Pentateuch side by side with the cuneiform tablets of Tel el-Amarna.

The Tel el-Amarna tablets have told us a good deal about the Hittites. We can follow their movements as they poured southward in band after band through the passes of the Taurus into the Syrian province of the decaying Egyptian empire. The power of the Mitannian kingdom, which had once extended as far westward as Tunip (Tennib north-west of Aleppo), was confined to the eastern side of the Euphrates, the Egyptian garrisons were driven southwards, and a body of Hittites established themselves on the banks of the Orontes which were henceforth known as Khattinâ, 'the Hittite land.'

Here was probably the Amma, Ammiya, or Am of the Tel el-Amarna letters, which would have extended as far as the Euphrates and Sajur if we should translate 'land of the children of Ammo' in Nu 22⁵. The Tel el-Amarna letters, however, seem to confine it more to the westward, and the same evidence is borne by one of the Hittite texts of Hamath, which associates the land of 'Amma' or 'Ammiya' with Hamath. The name is probably preserved in the classical Imma, the Aumi of the geographical list of Thothmes III.

Subbi-luliuma, the Hittite king, did not himself take much part in the raids upon Egyptian territory, though we hear of his burning Qatna on the Khabur and carrying off the image of its sun-god. But the local Hittite chiefs carved out new principalities for themselves in the south. Foremost among them was Aita-gama, who 'at the head of the Hittite soldiers' marched into Am and Ubi or Abitu, the Aup of the Egyptian monuments. Along with him went Tassu, or Dasa, Teuwatti (Tuates, Greek Τεάττης), the prince of Lapana, and Arzawaya (also called Arzauya and Arzawâ), the prince of Rukhizi. Tassu occupied Amma, while Teuwatti and Arzawaya accompanied Aita-gama to the land of Kinza, which bordered on Ubi, and of which

Kadesh on the Orontes was the capital. Kadesh was captured, and the Egyptian Government was compelled to 'acknowledge Aita-gama as its governor, content only if, like a modern Kurdish chieftain in Turkey, he rendered a nominal obedience to the Pharaoh. As the power of Egypt declined, even this nominal obedience was withdrawn; and Kadesh was made the southern capital of the Hittite kings, from which they were able to direct operations against Palestine.

Meanwhile, after offering his services as a leader of *condottieri* to the Pharaoh, Arzawaya died, and we next hear of his sons, no longer in northern Syria, but in the south of Palestine, where they are engaged in attacking Ebed-Kheba, the king of Jerusalem. Ebed-Kheba usually terms his enemies the Khabiri, in whom some scholars have seen the Hebrews, despite history and probability. When, however, we compare his letters together, we find that the Khabiri and the sons of Arzawaya are one and the same.

The Khabiri, we are told (WINCKLER, 180, 183, 185), had seduced Milki-il from his allegiance to Egypt, and in alliance with the sons of Lab'aya (also written Lab'awa) had overrun 'the land of the king' in southern Canaan, and were threatening Jerusalem. But in WINCKLER 182, which Knudtzon has shown to be part of WINCKLER 185, the place of the Khabiri is taken by the sons of Arzawâ, or Arzawaya. It was also the Khabiri, according to Ebed-Kheba (WINCKLER 185), by whom the alliance with Lab'aya in Mount Shechem had been made.

The fact that the Khabiri were really the Hittite *condottieri* of Arzawaya is further illustrated by a discovery to which my decipherment of the Hittite inscriptions has led. The kings of Carchemish call themselves kings of 'the country of Kas.' We find the name Kas throughout the Hittite region. Mount Kasios was in the land of the Khattinâ; there were Kases in Cappadocia and two towns called Kas-tabala, 'Kas of the Tabal,' in the territory occupied by the Tabalâ; while the Kashkash are associated by Ramses II. with the troops from Carchemish in the Hittite army, and the Kaskâ, according to Tiglath-pileser I., were 'soldiers of the Hittites.' Kasios is also the name of a man in an inscription of Tefenû.¹ But the name of Kas,

¹ Is the Cappadocian (?) land of Kus to be identified with Kas? 'Horses of Kus' were brought to Nineveh from Arpad and other north Syrian cities.

written Kasi, Ka'si and Kas'si, is also met with in the Tel el-Amarna tablets, where it has hitherto been misunderstood. In ignorance of the fact which my decipherment of the Hittite texts has now first revealed, it has been supposed to represent the Babylonians who were ruled at the time by a Kassite dynasty. Babylonia, however, is called Kar-Dunias and Sankhar or Shinar, while 'the land of Kassî' is assigned a totally different geographical position in the neighbourhood of Mitanni and the Hittites. Moreover, the references to the land of Kas, in the letters of Ebed-Kheba of Jerusalem, remain inexplicable so long as it is identified with Babylonia; once assume that it was a Hittite district and all is clear. In one passage Ebed-Kheba says: 'When a ship was on the sea (in the days of Egyptian maritime power) the arm of the mighty king occupied the lands of Naharaim and Kas, but now the Khabiri are occupying the cities of the king.' A contrast is drawn between the older days of the Egyptian empire, when Thothmes III. conquered Naharaim, and the present, when the Khabiri are conquering the Egyptian empire. Not only, therefore, must Kas have so closely adjoined Naharaim as to have been included in the conquerors of Thothmes III.—who, as we know, never made his way to Babylonia,—but the parallelism further obliges us to see in the Khabiri invaders from Naharaim and Kas. Otherwise Ebed-Kheba's reproach would have no point.

Now, consequently, we can understand two passages in another letter of Ebed-Kheba. In one of them the writer says: 'Behold, this is the deed of Milki-il and of the sons of Lab'aya, who have given the land of the king to the Khabiri; (but) behold, O king, my lord, I am righteous as regards the Ka'si.' In the other we read: 'If an evil deed has been committed against the men of the land of Kas, do not kill a good [servant] (like myself on that account). (For) the men of Kas are in my territory.'

Here (1) the Khabiri and the men of the land of Kas are identified together, and therefore (2) the men of Kas must have been Hittite followers of the sons of Arzawaya. In other words, Kas was a Hittite land.

The Egyptian Government in the Tel el-Amarna age was too dependent on its foreign mercenaries to afford to offend them. It was only too well satisfied if they accepted its pay and did not openly

deny its authority. Hence Ebed-Kheba received no support in his struggle with the *condottieri* of Arzawaya; on the contrary, he was threatened with punishment for opposing their occupation of his territory, and in one of his letters he plaintively asks the royal commissioner: 'Why do you love the Khabiri and hate the native governors?' The reason was really very clear, and Jerusalem and its cities were accordingly destined to pass into the hands of the Hittites.

It follows from all this that the Jebusites of the Old Testament must be the Khabiri of the letters of Ebed-Kheba, and that Jebus was the name given by its Hittite conquerors to Jerusalem. How Uriah came to be a Hittite by race is not explained, and the variations in the name of the Jebusite Aravnah, Aranya, or Ornan are due to its foreign origin. Aravnah and Aranya, indeed, are both possible Hittite names, Aranya being a derivative from the name of the Hittite city Arinna, and meaning 'the Arinnian,' and Aravnah being possibly for Arammunis, the name of the prince in the Hittite texts of Hamath, which is explained by the ideographs attached to it to signify 'great chief,' which is a derivative from Arammê, the name of the later king of Yakhani.¹

In Khabiri—which is not Khabirâ, and therefore not a proper name—I see the Assyrian *khabiri*, 'confederates.' At all events, it was the name given by the Canaanites to the particular body of *condottieri* who followed Arzawaya, as Lupakku, 'the troop of the god Luba,' was the name of the followers of Tassu (WINCKLER 125). Arzawaya itself is a derivative from Arzawa, signifying 'the Arzawayan.'² Rukhizi, of which Arzawaya had been the chief, is the Rukhasina of the treaty between Ramses II. and the Hittites. It is there preceded by the names of Sarisu and Khirpa, which Belck is certainly right in identifying with the classical Sirisa, now Kemer, on the Upper Sarus and Herpa on the Karmalas. Rukhizi would

¹ Sachau has shown that Arma was a Cilician deity, and as far back as 1880 I pointed out from the occurrence of the Carchemishian proper name, Aramis-sar-ilani, 'Aramis is king of the gods,' that Aramis must be a Hittite divinity. The Cilician name *Ἀραμώας* is a derivative, corresponding to a Hittite Arammuyas, as are also the Lycian Armmānō-ni and Arimfinu-ha. In one of the inscriptions of Carchemish, Arames is called 'the chief (*arammas*), supreme over the nine (gods).'

² *Ἀρζάβιος*, found in an inscription at Kastabala, in Cilicia, is the Greek form of the name.

similarly be in Komana or its vicinity, and the situation of Arzawa is accordingly approximately fixed. Arinna was another city in the same locality.

Like Arzawaya, Lab'aya, who established his headquarters at Shechem, was also a Hittite. Knudtzon has shown that one of the two Arzawa letters is addressed to him, and it is possible that he derived his name from the city of Lapana, of which Teuwatti (Tuates in the Vannic inscriptions) was chief. The suffix *-na* in Hittite signified 'belonging to the district of,' and Shalmaneser II. mentions a city of Lamena midway between Tanakun (Greek Thanakê) and Tarsus.

Another Hittite leader was Biridasya, who along with Arzawaya left Aitagama, in Kadesh, and marching southward occupied Abitu, or Ubi, (WINCKLER 142). The sons of Arzawaya, however, alone of the Hittite *condottieri* made their way into the south of Palestine, and there, under the name of Khabiri and Kasi, conquered a principality for themselves. Archæology has thus vindicated the statements of the Old Testament; there were Hittites in the south of Palestine, and the Jebusites of Jerusalem were of Hittite descent.

Whether there were Hittites in southern Canaan in the Abrahamic age is another matter. Their presence there may have been thrown backward like the presence of the Philistines in Gn 26. But my own belief is that the biblical writer was better acquainted than we are with the earlier history of his country. The southern movement of the northern tribes in the Tel el-Amarna age was but a repetition of a similar movement at the beginning of the Hyksos age, and there is no reason why bodies of Hittite marauders should not have done at an earlier period what they did at a later. History repeats itself in the East. But what makes me accept the historical accuracy of the narrative in Gn 23 is that the deed of sale described in it is a Babylonian contract of the Abrahamic age. It was drawn up in the legal language and with the legal formalities of the Babylonia of Khammurabi, in striking contrast to Israelitish usage as described in Ru 4⁷⁻¹¹. A duplicate or copy of the deed of which the technical term *מסד* is used may easily have been known to the writer of Genesis. Nor should it be forgotten that Thothmes III., in speaking of the Hittite region of Asia Minor and northern Syria, calls it 'the greater land of the Hittites,' implying that there was a lesser Hittite land, which was well

known to the Egyptians, and therefore presumably at no great distance from them.

Note on Judges i. 8.

The statement in Jg 1⁸ that Jerusalem had been destroyed by 'the children of Judah' is contradictory, not only to Jos 15⁶³, but also to v.²¹ in the same chapter of Judges, as well as to the fact that in the generation after the conquest, Jebus, or Jerusalem, was still 'the city of a stranger, that is, not of the children of Israel' (Jg 19¹⁰⁻¹²). It is therefore usually condemned as unhistorical, the narrative in Jos 10 being often supposed to have given occasion for its invention.

Certainly, as it stands it cannot be correct. We know from Jos 15 that it was Caleb and Othniel, the Kenizites, and not Judah, who captured Hebron and Kirjath-Sepher, and that the capture of these two cities was not preceded by the destruction of Jerusalem. Nor could Jerusalem have been 'smitten with the edge of the sword and set on fire,' in view of the passages already cited from the books of Joshua and Judges.

But the contradiction between vv.⁸ and ²¹ of Jg 1 must have been as apparent to the writer as it is to us, and if he wrote the first verse it was only because he had—or supposed he had—a written authority for the statement contained in it. The preceding narrative describing the conquest of Adoni-bezek is one of the fragments which had come down to him of the earlier history of Israel, and according to this narrative Adoni-bezek was brought to Jerusalem and died there.

The fact does not necessarily imply that Jerusalem was in possession of Judah; indeed, if it had been destroyed Adoni-bezek could not have been brought into it at all. The children of Judah might have been living peaceably with the inhabitants of Jerusalem as they are represented in Jos 15⁶³ as doing; or they might have been acting as the hired mercenaries of the Jebusites in a war between them and Bezek, as we find from the Tel el-Amarna tablets was often the case with the Bedâwin and other foreigners encamped in Canaan in pre-Israelitish days; or the hypothesis is even possible that Judah was at the time besieging Jerusalem. On any one of these suppositions Adoni-bezek could have been carried to Jerusalem, and the statement that Jerusalem was captured and burnt would be a false inference drawn by the writer of the Book of Judges.

Now let us turn to the historical evidence. When David took Jerusalem what he captured seems to have been only the Jebusite stronghold on Mount Zion, the Ophel of later days (2 S 5⁶⁻⁹). Accordingly, toward the end of his reign the future Temple-hill appears to have been once an uninhabited place, exposed to the winds, outside the walls of the city, where Araunah the Jebusite was able to have his threshing-floor. We may conclude, therefore, that the Jebusite city was confined to Zion, between the valleys of the Kishon and the Tyropæon.

But it is difficult to believe that a city occupying so small an area could have been the important capital of a territory such as we learn it was in the Tel el-Amarna days. May we not conjecture that the outlying portions of it had been destroyed and the city thus reduced to 'the stronghold of Zion'? If my old translation of a passage in one of the letters of Ebed-Kheba, the king of Jerusalem, is right: 'Just now the city of the mountain of Jerusalem, whose name is Bit-Ninip, the city of the king, has revolted to the men of Keilah,' we should have evidence that a sacred city already stood on 'the mountain of Jerusalem' apart from the 'stronghold' of Jerusalem itself. Zimmern and Winckler prefer to render: 'a city of the land

of Jerusalem,' but against this is the absence of *estin* 'a,' in the original. Doubtless Ebed-Kheba did not write good Assyrian, but he wanted to make his meaning clear.

Bezek lay to the south, and not to the north of Jerusalem, and was consequently in the road of Judah when advancing 'up' *i.e.* northwards from Simeon to Jerusalem (Jg 1⁸. 4). The belief that it was to the north is due to 1 S 11⁸, where, however, the Septuagint indicates that the original reading was Bamah. But its position is fixed by the geographical lists of Ramses III. or Medinet Habu. Here it comes once between Beth-Dagon (Baita-Duguna) and Karmel of Judah, and once (with the *b* omitted by the sculptor) between Migdal and Karmel, Khibur or Hebron and its Springs being associated with it. It is also one of the Canaanitish towns which Ramses II., at the Ramesseum, says that he had captured in his eighth year, and he describes it as being 'in the territory of Baitha-Antha,' or Beth-Anoth (Jos 15⁵⁹). Beth-Dagon is combined with Lachish (Tell el-Hesi) and Migdal-Gad in Jos 15⁴¹, and Beth-Anoth with Gedor and Eltekon, while the site of Karmel, a few miles south of Hebron, is well known. Where, therefore, Bezek stood, can be fixed within a few miles.

Contributions and Comments.

The Carob and the Locust.

THESE two things, one a vegetable and the other an animal, have been long confounded; and it is a difficult question to answer how and where the confusion arose.

The carob is the fruit of a tree, much cultivated in the East, known to botanists as *Ceratonia siliqua*. The first, or generic, name is that used by Theophrastus, but it was called *Κεραία* by Strabo. The second, or specific, name was given by the Romans to the somewhat fleshy and sweet pods of the tree, which belongs to the Pea family. The Greek name for the fruit was *Κεράριον*, on account of its curved or horn-like shape.

The tree is now popularly known as St. John's bread,¹ or locust tree. The pods are always sup-

posed to be the same as the 'husks' mentioned in the Parable of the Prodigal Son, as the Greek word is also *κεράριον*. Classical writers tell us that boys and pigs used to eat them, as well as the refuse, *cerevisia*, after extracting the sweet juice for making wine.

On the other hand, locusts were the insects, in Greek *ἀκρίς*, and *locusta* in Latin. It is not denied that locusts were sometimes eaten; the Parthians, it would appear, were specially addicted to them; but is it likely, *à priori*, that such food would be St. John's? A diet requires some sort of vegetable matter of a farinaceous kind; but locusts and wild honey contain none; whereas carobs, like dates, would sustain life. Even they are poor enough, and were usually accompanied with coarse bread, etc. Thus Persius (*Sat.* 3) says—

Insomnis quibus detonsa juventus
Invigilat, siliquis et grandi pasta polenta.

¹ This name was given to the fruit by herbalists of the seventeenth century.

Similarly Horace wrote—

Vivit siliquis et pane secundo.

Now the first passage in the Bible which raises a doubt whether the word 'locust' is correct, but should not rather be 'carob,' is in Ecclesiastes (12⁵). Both A. and R.V. have 'The grasshopper shall be a burden'; while R.V. adds in the margin, 'or, shall drag itself along.'

Let us consider the passage. Ecclesiastes is referring to two edible things, 'The almond shall be despised and the caper-berry shall come to nothing; *Because* man goeth to his long home.' They are evidently intended to be in some way connected with an aged man's decease; but what the grasshopper has to do with it, is very obscure. Because he can no longer break the almond shell with his teeth, may account for that fruit being 'despised.'¹

Again, the caper is not a 'berry' but a flower-bud, which if not gathered will burst into flower, bearing large white petals. Hence the idea seems to be that, acting no longer as a stimulant, it is neglected, not gathered, and allowed to come to nothing.

Between the almond and the caper is the grasshopper or locust. Can it be the carob? Turning to the Hebrew text the word is חנב, but חרב is the carob. This word is curiously enough also used for the 'curved horn' (sword) of the elephant² (Job 40¹⁹).

Turning to the LXX, we read παχυνθῇ ἡ ἀκρίς. What does this mean? does the grasshopper grow fat?

But suppose the middle letter of the Hebrew word ח got accidentally replaced by ט, the 'carob' is at once changed into a 'grasshopper'! and παχυνθῇ becomes applicable to the thick, fleshy, and now *coarse* fruit. Moreover, why should the grasshopper be a 'burden,' or 'drag itself along,' the very last thing likely for a 'hopper' to do! Is it a burden to itself or to the dying man? Yet further. There would seem to have been

¹ Gesenius points out that 'blossom' is a mistake, and 'does not agree with the context.'

² The hippopotamus seems less applicable to the following: 'He eateth grass like an ox; his strength is in his loins; he moveth his tail like a cedar; his bones are as tubes of brass; God hath furnished him with his חרב.' The hippopotamus has nothing suggestive of a sword. The usual word for 'horn' is קרן, of the same etymology as κέρας, cornu and 'horn.'

another confusion in the Greek words, as well as in the Hebrew. Κέρας is easily converted into ἀκρίς, simply by a transposition of the first vowel; and a 'horn' becomes a 'locust.' Or κεράτιον might as easily become ἀκρίδιον, used by the naturalist, Dioscorides.

Nothing is more common than such literal transpositions. Thus, 'almug' is the same as 'algum,' just as we say 'cocoa' for 'cacao'; and rustics persist in calling 'violets,' 'voilets.' 'Brachylogy' or 'euphony' is the cause.

The above confusion has greatly puzzled commentators. Much variety occurs among their suggestions to get over the difficulty of St. John eating locust. Thus, e.g., ἀχράς, a wild pear; ἄκρα, a top shoot; ἐγκρίς, a cake made with oil and honey; not to add καρίς, a marine prawn, have each in turn been proposed, but no one, so far as I know, has ever suggested the simple substitution or transposition of a letter.

The conclusion, therefore, arrived at is—if the above hypothesis be acceptable—that Ecclesiastes *meant* the carob, and that St. John *ate* them.

GEORGE HENSLOW.

London.

The Modern Greek Testament of the Bible Society.

THE article of Professor J. H. Moulton on Krumbacher's 'Problem of the Modern Greek Literary Dialect' (THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, xiv. 550) makes me curious to learn a little more about the Modern Greek Testaments of the British and Foreign Bible Society.

The article speaks (following Krumbacher) of 'the Bible Society Version of 1829'; it quotes then 'from Krumbacher, who cites the *original edition*, Mt 3¹⁰, beginning 'καὶ ἰδοὺ' and ending 'βάλλεται εἰς τὸ πῦρ.' The writer adds the note: 'My own copy, dated 1872, shows many alterations for the worse, e.g. πᾶν for κάθε, and μὴ κάμνον (!) for the relative clause.'

As far as I am aware, the first edition of the N.T. in Greek and Modern Greek was published by the B.F.B.S. in 1810. The Bible Catalogue of the British Museum (col. 756) mentions first a copy with the imprint: (1) ἐξέτυπωθη παρ Ἰωαννου Τιλίγγιου της Χελσεας

ἐν Δονδιῳ, 1810, 12^o, p. 1106. Then 'a duplicate with a different title-page': (2) *Χελοσα*, 1810, 12^o.

To this set my copy seems to belong; for it has on the title: 'Εν ΧΕΛΣΕ'Α. 'Εξετυπώθη παρ. I.T. 'Ετει, etc., α' ω ι. 1810. On the back of the title stands the note: 'L.B. Ignoscat Lector benevolus, quod, incuriâ Typographi, in D. Marci Textum et in alios nonnullos locos, typi Literae Capitalis K, majoris quam ut decet moduli, irrepererint.' I do not know whether (1) or (2) is earlier. It does not matter. Ed. Reuss mentions a copy with the year 1814, and another edition, where the letter K is corrected, with the years 1819 and 1824.

The next copy in my possession is of the year 1827: (3) ΕΝ ΔΟΝΔΙΝΗ 'Ετυπώθη παρὰ 'Ρ. ΟΥΑΤΤΣ Δαπάνη τῆς ἐν Βρετανίᾳ καὶ παρ' 'Αλλογενέσιν 'Εταιρείας τῆς 'Ιερῶς Βίβλου, ΕΤΕΙ αἰκζ' [1827] 8, 722 pages.

Apparently a later reprint of this edition is that mentioned above, of the year 1829; the Catalogue of the British Museum mentions another of 1830.

Now *both* editions of 1810 and 1827 have in the specimen quoted *να* instead of *ἰδοῦ*, and *τὴν φωτίαν* instead of *τὸ πῦρ*. How is this difference to be explained? In other places they show a great many minor variations; for instance, Mk 3⁵ *γερὸν* and *ὑγίς*, ⁹ *μονόξυλον* and *πλουάριον*, ¹⁹ *σπῆτι* and *οἶκον*, ⁸²⁻⁸⁵ *μάνα* and *μητέρα*. But in the main it is the same translation, and its author seems to be Anastasius Michael Macedo, whose version was revised by Liberius Coletti, and first edited by A. H. Francke, with a Greek preface by J. Heymann, at Halle, in 1710 (1106 pages, exactly as the London edition of 1810).

There is another version in Modern Greek by Maximus Kalliupolites, first published 1638, with a preface by the famous C. Lukaris; also London, 1713, 1814.

The Russian Bible Society published an edition at Petersburg (printed at Shacklewell), 1817; in Athens, 1844, an edition was published by N. Bambas (H. D. Leaves, K. N. Philadelphius).

There are mentioned editions from New York, 1842; London, 1863; but I do not know to which version they belong.

Perhaps the coming jubilee of the B.F.B.S. will tell us something more of these versions. From my own experience I heartily recommend to the

student of the Greek Testament the comparison with such a version into Modern Greek.

EB. NESTLE.

Maulbronn.

Raka.

Is it possible that the difficulty evidently experienced by translators in dealing with this word arises from the fact that it is not a word at all? Just as the meaning of Ps 119¹⁸¹ is best understood by opening one's mouth and drawing in one's breath, so that which is reprehensible in *Raka* may possibly only be comprehended by pronouncing it with very strong consonants and very light vowels.

G. A. KING,

Master of the Supreme Court.

The Turin Fire.

STUDENTS of the textual criticism of the Gospels will be glad to be assured that amongst the MSS which have been saved uninjured from the disastrous Turin fire is the celebrated old Latin Codex Bobbiensis k. Wishing to verify the newspaper reports to this effect, I made inquiry of Professor Carlo Frati, who with his assistants displayed such heroism in rescuing so many precious books and MSS, and he informs me that k is really safe and sound.

I fear, however, that there is serious loss to chronicle even in the limited field of New Testament MSS. I sent Professor Frati a list of the MSS given in Miller's *Scrivener*, vol. i. p. 404, and inquired as to their fate, and his reply, translated, is as follows:—'As to the codices of which you sent me a list, I am unable at present to give you a certain answer; but I fear that the greater part of them has either totally perished or has been reduced to a pitiable condition. Few Greek MSS were saved, and these almost entirely from the first three shelves (i., ii., iii.) of the cases B and C, not from the last three (v., vi., vii.). The Latin codices had a better fate; of these several hundreds were saved, and amongst them a good number of the Bobbio codices, of which the library possessed about seventy.'

From this communication I gather that of the

eighteen MSS given by Miller's Scrivener, more than half have perished. Professor Frati says that he may be able, later on, to furnish some additional information, and this, if of sufficient interest, I shall be glad to communicate to THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

It may here be noted that there appear to be

one or two misprints in Miller's Scrivener in the numbers given of the Turin MSS. Thus, on p. 404 we have the numbers B v. 4 and B vii. 6, which on p. 231 appear as B v. 24 and B vii. 16 respectively.

ALBERT BONUS.

Alphington, near Exeter.

Inter Alia.

THE long-promised new edition of Dr. Cheyne's *Psalms* is almost ready now. We have turned to Cheyne first hitherto when we wanted light on the Psalter. We hope Jerahmeel has not put it out. The publishers are Messrs. Kegan Paul.

The sermon on the Transfiguration by the late Professor A. B. Davidson, upon which some notes were written in last month's issue of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, is found, not, as there stated, in the volume entitled *The Called of God*, but in the volume entitled *Waiting upon God*. Two volumes have been selected from Dr. Davidson's manuscript. Their titles have been carefully chosen, in order to indicate the character of the sermons each volume contains. For in the one the leading thought is 'ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you'; in the other it is the response that is prominent, and the reward—'They that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength.' The similarity of title, however, caused the slip which has perplexed our correspondents.

In a review of Oakesmith's *Religion of Plutarch* in the *Hibbert Journal* for January, Professor Percy Gardner says: 'One wonders when the time will come when it will be possible to read in churches passages from the moral writings of Plutarch or the Manual of Epictetus, instead of such stories as those of the treachery of Jael and the massacres of Jehu. It is obvious that the former writings are not only of higher moral tone, but also far more in the line of descent of modern Christianity. But the history of religion proves that ritual is far more conservative than religious belief.'

We are to have a new series of Records of the Past; but it is not a direct successor to Professor Sayce, so the title is to be *Ancient Records*. Babylonia and Assyria will occupy six volumes, Egypt twelve, and Palestine five. The general editor is President Harper of Chicago; Professor J. H. Breasted will edit the Egyptian volumes. The price is not announced. The publishers in America will be the Chicago University Press, in this country Messrs. Macmillan.

One of the most useful books for the study of Church History that we have seen is Professor Gwatkin's *Selections from Early Christian Writers*, which Messrs. Macmillan published in 1897 (4s. 6d.). Messrs. T. & T. Clark announce a volume that seems intended to do the same service for Christian Apologetics. Its authors are Professor Caldecott of King's College, London, and Dr. H. R. Mackintosh of Aberdeen.

Dr. Wells of Glasgow has undertaken to edit the letters and write the life of the late Dr. Hood Wilson of Edinburgh. The publishers will be Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton. If any of Dr. Wilson's correspondents have letters or information which Dr. Wells should see, he will count it a favour to be communicated with.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, St. Cyrus, Montrose.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

IN the Extra Volume of the *Dictionary of the Bible* the longest, and in some other respects the most notable, article will be that on the RELIGION OF ISRAEL. The article was given into the hands of the late Professor A. B. Davidson. He entered upon it with relish. 'I have been preparing for it all my life,' he wrote. But the end came before it was written. Then the article was undertaken by Professor Emil Kautzsch of Halle.

Professor Kautzsch has spent two years upon it. He has recognized its importance; he has discovered its difficulty. It is not merely that the old method of gathering together proof texts is no longer available; the scope of the subject is nearly as much enlarged as the method of handling it is altered. The religion of Israel is more than the religion of the Old Testament. It is the religion of one of the Semitic nations. And it will never again be adequately described without the simultaneous use of both the historical and the comparative methods.

In the article by the Rev. John Reid, M.A., of Dundee, entitled "“Lord” and “The Lord” in Acts," which is published in this issue, there is a paragraph to which it may be well to direct attention. For it seems to contain not only the simple and satisfactory solution of one of the most

puzzling expressions in the Acts of the Apostles, but also what appears to be a most important discovery in the history of early Christianity.

Mr. Reid has made an independent study of the use of the word 'Lord' (κύριος), whether with or without the article, first in the Gospels and now in the Acts. His results in the field of the Gospels were welcomed with gratitude by many New Testament students. The study of the word in the Acts has been more trying, and the results will be more welcome. But the centre of interest in the new paper is the discovery that the very moment when Christianity ceased to be of the Jews and became the religion of the world is recorded in the New Testament in the use of a most familiar word.

The passage is Acts x. 36. St. Peter is addressing Cornelius. If he had been addressing a Jew he would have been content to say 'preaching peace by Jesus Christ.' But he is addressing a Gentile. The word Christ, that is, Messiah, has no meaning for a Gentile. It carries no associations with it. So St. Peter adds the explanation—'He is Lord of all.' That word 'Lord' has a meaning. But as he uttered it St. Peter did more than make himself intelligible to Cornelius, he said, unconsciously almost, we may be sure, 'Where there is neither Jew nor Gentile.' From that moment, from the utterance of that word,

Christianity entered upon its mission to the whole world.

The first course of lectures under the Constitution of the Bruce Lectureship has been delivered by the Rev. Lewis A. Muirhead, B.D., and has been published by Mr. Melrose, under the title of *The Eschatology of Jesus* (crown 8vo, pp. xxvii, 224; 6s.). If Professor Bruce could have made the choice, this is the lecturer and this is the subject of lecture which he would have begun with. The very name 'Jesus' was made possible in this country by Dr. Bruce. Common enough in Germany, it was avoided here till he boldly set the way. And Mr. Muirhead is just as bold as he was, just as sure that in this direction lies our intellectual salvation, just as heedless if we are following close or lagging far behind.

That is quite commendable. There must be some independent workers in a generation, even in theology. There must be some who not only 'see with their own eyes' (it is a phrase of Mr. Muirhead's), but are unconcerned whether they get us to see along with them or not. If any injustice arises, it is they themselves that suffer. And as there must always be martyrs, they should be the martyrs always who choose the road to martyrdom themselves, not they who are driven into it by others.

Not that Mr. Muirhead will receive deposition from the ministry or even suffer from a 'heresy hunt.' But his view of 'Jesus' is not the view of the men around him. He will therefore suffer from isolation. And, impalpable as that is, is it not what we now mean when we say Hell? To be outside, to know that the door is shut, is that not what we understand now by 'the worm that dieth not and the fire that is not quenched'? Dr. Bruce knew that the door was shut for him in this life—not to men's homes or to men's hearts, he had all his share of affectionate devotion, but to men's minds and to the motives that make

them men. He knew that his countrymen could not accept 'Jesus.' He knew that the name did not carry intellectual conviction or moral weight with them. And Mr. Muirhead knows it also.

Is Mr. Muirhead so unorthodox then? No, by no means. Give him 'Jesus' and he is almost ostentatiously orthodox. To give him 'Jesus' is to grant that our Lord might be ignorant on any conceivable subject; but Mr. Muirhead rushes to assure us that there is scarcely a single actual subject on which He was ignorant. Did He not question the authorship of the 110th Psalm?—'it does not follow that His mind was not open on that subject in a way impossible to the average Scribe.' Did He say seriously, 'The Scripture cannot be broken'?—that 'does not prove that He had the same idea of inspiration as a contemporary Jewish theologian, or even as the Apostle Paul.' And if anyone asserts that at one time Jesus said He did not know the day or hour of the glorious Advent, at another that it would infallibly fall within that generation, Mr. Muirhead considers it undeniable that 'this inconsistency is chargeable only to the evangelists, and not to Jesus.'

What then are we giving when we give Mr. Muirhead 'Jesus'? We need St. Paul to answer that.

Mr. John Joseph McVey, publisher, importer, and bookseller of Philadelphia, has issued a translation of Gunkel's *Israel and Babylon*. It is one of the many answers that have been made to Professor Friedrich Delitzsch's famous lectures on 'Babel-Bibel.'

Why is it that Professor Delitzsch's lectures have made such a sensation in Germany? They contain nothing that was not quite familiar to all Assyriologists and to most students of the Old Testament. Professor Gunkel says it was first of all because they were delivered before the emperor. Next because the newspapers got hold

of them. And chiefly because what is quite familiar to Old Testament students is often quite unknown to German pastors and people.

Professor Gunkel regrets that the lectures were delivered before the emperor. It gave some people the impression that their contents had the emperor's approval. And when the emperor announced that they had not, it made some people think that Professor Delitzsch was on the way to become a martyr for the truth. He regrets that the newspapers got hold of them. For the newspapers feed upon 'events,' and Professor Gunkel believes that the progress of knowledge is imperceptible; the moment it becomes an 'event' it is checked. And he regrets that the evangelical Church is so lamentably estranged from evangelical science. For had it not been so, lectures like those of Professor Delitzsch would never have surprised the Church as they have done, and found her almost weaponless. But most of all, Professor Gunkel regrets that the lectures were ever delivered.

For Professor Delitzsch had no business to leave Assyriology, where he is a master, and enter the field of the Old Testament, where he is not at home and quite unhappy. What he said about the antiquity of Babylonian civilization was altogether admirable. What he said about the dependence of Israel on that civilization was altogether intolerable. Professor Gunkel does not deny the dependence. He affirms it. But he holds that the originality of the religion of Israel, which Professor Delitzsch denied, is far more conspicuous than its dependence.

Professor Gunkel affirms the dependence of the religion of Israel on the religion of Babylonia. In the later time, in the days of the Babylonian Captivity, so much did Israel learn from Babylon that the character of the nation was wholly changed. It forgot its own language, and learned a new one. Post-exilic Judaism became so transformed by the civilization of the nation under whose influence it

had come, that it was 'bound to the old Israelite people by only a slender thread.'

But even in the oldest times the religion of Israel was largely derived from the religion of Babylonia. Mount Sinai was probably named after the Babylonian moon-god Sin. Mount Nebo, where Moses died, was named after Nebo, the Babylonian Mercury. The story of the Deluge is 'quite indisputably' of Babylonian origin. The Flood, the ark, the contents of the ark, the stranding on a mountain, the sending forth of a dove and a raven, the exit, the sacrifice, the sweet savour which the gods smelt—these could not possibly be coincidences. And when we consider, the inconceivable age of Babylonian civilization, and of the Deluge narrative in particular, when we remember that it is not in Israel, but in Babylonia, with its flat plains watered by great streams, that floods have any terror, we cannot doubt, says Professor Gunkel, that the Israelite story came from Babylonia.

But Professor Gunkel holds that the originality of the religion of Israel is greater than its dependence. Even in the stories of the Flood, with all their similarity, the difference is almost immeasurable. We are in different worlds. 'In the Babylonian story, a wild, grotesque polytheism; the gods outscheme and combat one another; they quake before the Flood, and cower like dogs in the heaven; they swarm like flies to the after-sacrifice. The biblical story speaks of One God, whose just retribution sends the Flood, and who graciously protects the righteous man after He has tried him.'

There is one feature in the Babylonian narrative of the Flood with which Dr. Delitzsch is much delighted. The Noah of the Babylonian story is represented as sorrowing over the fate of the drowning multitude around him. This is the touch that makes Dr. Delitzsch say that the Babylonian legend 'appeals to us with far greater force than the biblical narrative.' Professor Gunkel

admits its appeal to modern sentimentalism. But its force is considerably diminished when we remember that the Babylonian Noah did not warn his fellow-citizens of their danger, but, on the contrary, preached smooth things and promised prosperity all the while the ark was abuilding.

Something has been said on another page of the use of the name 'Jesus' in place of the more familiar 'Christ.' It had better be said now that there is worth in such a name. There is apologetic worth. When Professor Peake began his lecture at the Central Hall in Manchester on the question, 'Did Jesus rise again,' he found it necessary first of all to prove that there was a Jesus to rise. In apologetics we must begin where the apology can take hold.

There are those who doubt that there ever was a Jesus to rise. Mr. Peake had to prove first that 'Jesus was an historical character.' How did he prove that? First, by calling attention to the self-consistency of His character, and the impossibility of inventing it. Next, by pointing to the originality of His teaching taken as a whole. Finally, and especially, by quoting certain sayings which no one would ever have invented and put into an imaginary hero's mouth. The sayings are such as: 'Why callest thou me good?'; 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?'; and the confession that He was ignorant of the day of His second coming.

But when Jesus is proved to be historical, what have we got? For Professor Peake's purpose very little. An historical Jesus, who did and said the things which the Gospels report, is not, after all, the person whom Professor Peake wishes to commend. So he proceeds to the proof of the Resurrection. We must know Jesus after the flesh? Well, the moment we know Him so, let us pass on. Let us say, 'I know Him so henceforth no more.' We must know the power of His resurrection.

Now there are two ways of proving the Resurrection. There is a negative way. Answer all the theories that have been invented to account for the belief in the Resurrection. That is a good way. For it is not difficult to answer them. But there is a better way than that. There is a positive argument for the Resurrection, and Professor Peake uses it with effect.

This is the argument. The first Christians believed that the Jewish Messiah had been crucified. How did they come to believe that? Some expectation of a Messiah all the Jews had. It can be proved that they had no expectation of a suffering Messiah. Here Mr. Muirhead's book on *The Eschatology of Jesus* is of great value. He shows that, scanty as the evidence is, it is yet sufficient, for it is all one way. 'Nothing,' says Mr. Muirhead, 'is more certain in our information regarding Jewish conceptions of the Messiah, in or near the time of our Lord, than that they did not include the idea that He should suffer vicariously for the sins of His people.' Shortly after this time there is found in *Fourth Ezra* (circa 70 A.D.) the idea that the Messiah is to die, but that is 'only an incident in an eschatological programme, which assigned to the Messiah no other function than that of living for 400 years with the godly previous to a final judgment executed by Jehovah Himself.' Still later, in the fourth century A.D., the *Targum of Jonathan*, 'perhaps the most authoritative document of what may be called Patristic Judaism,' admits that there is a reference to the Messiah in Isaiah liii., 'but carefully excludes from the scope of the reference what would be to Christians just the most relevant passages.'

Where did the first Christians get their idea, not that the Messiah might suffer and die merely, but that His sufferings and death made Him the Messiah? When Trypho the Jew is pressed by Justin Martyr, he admits the doctrine of a suffering Messiah, because he sees that it is contained in the Old Testament. But he admits it most reluctantly. Why did Justin Martyr glory in it?

Not only did Justin glory in a suffering and dying Messiah, but he gloried in a Messiah who had been crucified. Trypho could not do that. Trypho could not stand the Crucifixion. For to a Jew death was one thing, crucifixion quite another. To suffer [and to die was the lot of all men, and might be the lot of the Messiah, but to 'hang upon a tree' was the lot only of the criminal, and brought him under the curse of God's law. Trypho knew the law. He interpreted it, as all his countrymen interpreted it, saying that the words 'cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree,' meant 'cursed is he that is crucified.' He could believe, however reluctantly, that the Messiah might come to die; but nothing would make him believe that the Messiah could come under the curse of God—nothing short of faith in Jesus as the Messiah.

This is the positive argument for the Resurrection. The first Christians believed that the Messiah had been crucified. That revolution in their thinking was not wrought by belief in an historical Jesus. It was not wrought by the sight of suffering and of death. It was wrought by belief in the Resurrection of Jesus from the dead, making Him, first in spite of, and then because of His sufferings and death, the Christ of God.

The University of Leiden has called an Englishman to succeed Professor van Manen. A few days after Mr. Kirsopp Lake arrived from Oxford he had to deliver his Inaugural Lecture. The Chair is of New Testament Exegesis and Early Christian Literature, but Mr. Lake is first of all a student of the New Testament text, and he spoke upon 'The Influence of Textual Criticism on the Exegesis of the New Testament.' He spoke in English. At the close of the lecture he looked his students in the face. 'I am very sorry,' he said, 'that for a few months I shall be handicapped by my inability to use your language, but I hope that by next September I shall be in a position to lecture in Dutch, at least partially, even though it may be

necessary to apologize for frequent solecisms, and for an imperfect pronunciation.' The lecture is published in this country by Messrs. Parker & Son of Oxford.

Professor Lake chose Textual Criticism for his Inaugural Lecture because he believes that there is a vital connexion between the Criticism of the Text, its Exegesis, and Theology. He believes that there is a right order in studying these subjects, and that that is the order. We must be critics of the New Testament text if we are to be successful exegetes, we must be close students of exegesis if ever we are to be theologians. And Professor Kirsopp Lake proves it.

He proves it by one great example. But before coming to the example let us see what Professor Lake thinks of the present state of Textual Criticism. He thinks that we are at the beginning of a new period in the Textual Criticism of the Gospels. In the nineteenth century textual critics were occupied with constructing the 'true text' of the Gospels. That process culminated in the great work of Westcott and Hort. They did not succeed in constructing the 'true text.' In that, though it was their one great aim, the work of Westcott and Hort was a failure. They succeeded in showing that the *Textus Receptus* was not the true text. But when they took the Vatican manuscript as the best representative and practical embodiment of the true text, they were wrong. The Vatican manuscript probably does no more than represent the text that was current in Alexandria in the third century. The true text, says Professor Lake, cannot be found in any manuscript or group of manuscripts, nor in any selection from manuscripts that can ever be made. Greek manuscripts, as a whole, represent but one type of a text and its corruptions; the Latin versions and the Fathers represent another type; the Syriac versions a third; and Clement of Alexandria may provide us with a fourth. The failure of Westcott and Hort—Professor Lake calls it a magnificent failure, better

than most men's successes would have been—was due to their neglect of the other sources for the text, the attempt to construct a true text out of the Greek manuscripts alone.

Professor Lake says that something has to be done before even a beginning is made with the construction of the true text of the Gospels. All the local texts have to be edited. At the close of the second century Africa had its own local text of the Gospels, Alexandria had its own local text, there was another local text in the East, and perhaps there were others elsewhere. None of these local texts was the true text. Each of them 'presents a definite series of interpolations and a definite series of omissions.' They have to be edited. And, inasmuch as the number of manuscripts exhibiting any local text is not large, it becomes the duty (Professor Lake seems to look upon it as a privilege) of the textual critic to employ conjectural emendation.

Then when all the local texts have been edited, we may begin to construct the true text. What will its character be? It is too early to answer yet. But Professor Lake is sure that it will not be the text of Westcott and Hort, for he believes that there are corruptions in *all* the manuscripts in existence, and that the true text will never be found by using manuscripts alone. And so we come to his great example.

It is the passage to which we appeal for the institution of the Sacrament of Baptism. It is the words in St. Matthew 28¹⁹, 'baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.' Those words are found in all the manuscripts. Yet Professor Lake does not believe that they belong to the true text. He believes that they are an interpolation in the true text, an interpolation made perhaps in Africa. He believes that Mr. F. C. Conybeare has proved that.

For Mr. Conybeare has shown that Eusebius quotes Mt 28¹⁹ at least eighteen times, and always

in the form, 'go ye into all the world and make disciples of all nations in my name,' omitting all reference to baptism. It is true there are four passages in which Eusebius quotes the usual text. But two of these are in the writings against Marcellus, which are wrongly attributed to Eusebius; and as for the other two, Professor Lake says simply, 'I do not feel at all sure that the reading in these two passages is so far above suspicion as to justify the statement that Eusebius knew the traditional text.'

Now Eusebius lived in one of the greatest Christian libraries of the fourth century. If the texts at his command had contained the words 'baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost,' Professor Lake cannot see how he could have omitted them. And since it can be shown that neither did Aphraates of Nisibis nor Justin Martyr know these words, he thinks that a very strong case has been made out against them. He thinks, in short, that the true text when it is constructed, will not contain them.

What will be the result? The result will be that the command of our Lord to go and make disciples of all nations will be seen to have been understood in one part of the early Church in one way, in another part in another way. The African Church (probably) understood it to include baptism, and so got the usual formula for baptism introduced in their text of the Gospels. But the Syrian Church did not so understand it. Thus the question of the reading directly affects the exegesis. We are compelled to ask for ourselves, Did our Lord mean baptism, or did He not? And if we decide that He did not, there arises the further question of theology. What then, we go on to ask, is the true place of Baptism in the scheme of Christian doctrine?

Professor Lake goes on to that question. This passage in St. Matthew is not the only passage in which Baptism has been found. There is a passage in St. John. Has textual criticism any-

thing to say of John 3⁵, 'Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit'? If the true text is to be found in the manuscripts, textual criticism has nothing to say, for these words are found in practically all the Greek manuscripts in existence. But Professor Lake holds that the true text will not be found in the manuscripts. To get at the true text everything has to be taken into account, manuscripts, versions, quotations, and conjecture.

Now Professor Lake would not have suspected Jn 3⁵ if he had not already suspected Mt 28¹⁹. For if there were no doubt that Christ instituted Baptism in the formal manner of St. Matthew, there would be little occasion for surprise that He should insist on Baptism as the avenue of entrance to the kingdom. But the rejection of Mt 28¹⁹ compels the examination of Jn 3⁵.

And when Jn 3⁵ is examined exegetically, it is observed that the whole narrative would be more homogeneous if the words *of water and* were omitted. 'Christ is explaining that the kingdom of God can only be entered by a change in the life of man, which makes him no longer primarily material, but primarily spiritual and only secondarily material. This change is compared to birth, and as Nicodemus did not understand the meaning of the comparison, an explanation is given. That explanation is first set out in v.⁵, and then is expanded and made more plain in the following verses, ending with the phrase, *so is everyone that is born of the Spirit*, the antithesis throughout being the usual one between Flesh and Spirit, or in Professor James' phrase, between the *once-born* and the *twice-born*.'

But it will not do to cut out the words *of water and* simply because the passage is easier without them. It must at least be shown that there was

some reason for interpolating them. Professor Lake believes that there was a reason. The necessity of Baptism to entrance into the kingdom, or in other words, the fact of Regeneration by Baptism, was an article of belief in the early Church. The Baptism was more than the Regeneration. In the Apostolic Constitutions and in the Clementine Homilies this very passage is interpreted as if it had to do with Baptism and with nothing else. Is it surprising that the words expressing the necessity of Baptism should have been inserted into the passage which speaks of Regeneration? Professor Lake thinks it will be less surprising if we remember that Hilary quotes the 8th verse with the same words *of water and* inserted into it, and that he is supported in this by the Old Latin and Old Syriac versions, as well as by the Sinaitic Codex.

But Professor Lake can go one step farther. He believes that there is one item of direct evidence. He finds it in Justin Martyr. In the 61st chapter of his *Apology*, Justin Martyr gives a description of the regeneration of converts, which he associates with Baptism in the name of the Trinity. In support of his theory he quotes words which Professor Lake believes to be from the Fourth Gospel, and indeed the very verse before us. But how does he quote the verse? Without the words *of water*. He says, 'For Christ said, Except ye be born again, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of Heaven.' He quotes the verse without the reference to baptism, although it is his very purpose to prove that Regeneration is associated with Baptism. In order to prove that, he goes on to quote a passage from the Book of Isaiah. It does not seem to Professor Lake possible to believe that Justin knew either the present text of Jn 3⁵ or the baptismal formula in St. Matthew.

'Lord' and 'The Lord' in Acts.

BY THE REV. JOHN REID, M.A., DUNDEE.

THE questions relating to the application of these titles in the Gospels were comparatively easy (see THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, vol. xii. pp. 425-430). When we attempt to determine the reference of the titles in Acts, we find the task exceedingly difficult. It is a tangled skein which has to be unravelled. We cannot always say with certainty whether the reference is to God or Jesus. Blass is not exaggerating when he speaks of the 'solita confusio inter Κύριος et Θεός in Acts.' The reading varies repeatedly, and beyond that, the use of a common title for God and Jesus complicates the matter greatly. The fact is that we can almost see the Church's faith growing before our eyes. We can recognize that the new light, which had dawned upon the world, is still struggling with the darkness of the night. The Resurrection and Risen Life of Jesus led to higher conceptions of His personality, and these show their influence in the application to both of this common title. An examination of the use of the titles brings into view certain elements in the Christology of the early Church, some interesting facts in the preaching of the gospel to Jews and Gentiles, and a fresh interpretation of a few important or difficult passages.

I. Κύριος and ὁ Κύριος, used generally as titles of reverence or of ownership.

(a) Κύριος—

Ac 10⁴ 'What is it Lord?' also 10¹⁴ 11⁸.

Ac 16³⁰ 'Sirs (κύριοι), what must I do to be saved?'

(β) Ὁ Κύριος—

Ac 16¹⁶ 'Much gain to her masters'; also 16¹⁹.

Ac 25²⁶ 'I have no certain thing to say to my Lord.'

The general use of the titles under this whole section may be compared with the same use of them in the Gospels. Of the 7 instances in Ac, 4 are applied to men—one only in direct address. In Mt we find 30 instances, in Mk 9, in Lk 17, and in Jn 5. Does the smaller number of instances in Ac and Jn indicate a tendency in the early Church to restrict the title 'Lord' to God and Jesus? The fact that Mk employs the title in fewer instances than Mt or Lk does not make

the question meaningless. Mk is very sparing in the use of the title, employing it only 23 times in all forms of its use, as compared with 76 times in Mt, 96 times in Lk, and 49 times in Jn. In Jn the titles are applied to Jesus 40 times, and to God 4 times. It would almost seem as if Luke, in writing his second treatise, had determined to restrict the use of the title in direct address to Jesus and God. The forms of address in Acts are generally different from those employed in the Gospel. 'Men' or 'sirs' (ἄνδρες) alone, or with the name of the country or town, is the most common form, as 'men of Judea,' 2¹⁴, etc.

In the first two instances in (β) the title is used in its exact significance of 'owner'; in the third instance the reference is to the emperor Nero. It is interesting to notice that Augustus and Tiberius, in the furtherance of their pretended democratic policy, refused the title, ὁ κύριος, because it denoted the relationship of master and slave. Their successors made no such pretence, and sanctioned its use as an Imperial title (*Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, vol. xi. p. 362, note 7, Conybeare and Howson).

II. Κύριος and ὁ Κύριος, as titles for God.

(a) Κύριος—

1. In quotations from the O.T., as—

Ac 3²² 'A prophet shall (the) Lord God raise up'; also 2³⁹.

Ac 7⁴⁰ 'What house—saith (the) Lord?' also 2²⁴ 15¹⁷.

Ac 13¹⁰ 'The right ways of (the) Lord' (T., Nestle omit art., Weiss and W.H. insert it).

2. In general phrases of O.T. origin, as—

Ac 5⁹ 'Spirit of (the) Lord'; also 8³⁹.

Ac 5¹⁹ 'Angel of (the) Lord'; also 8²⁶ 12⁷⁻²³.

Ac 7³¹ 'Voice of (the) Lord.'

Ac 11²¹ 'Hand of (the) Lord'; also 13¹¹ (where T., W.H., and Nestle omit art.).

3. In particular phrase, as—

Ac 1²⁴ 'Lord—show whether of these twain,' etc.

Ac 4²⁹ 'Lord—behold their threatenings.'

Ac 17²⁴ 'Lord of heaven and earth.'

(β) Ὁ Κύριος—

1. In quotations from the O.T., as—

Ac 2²⁵ 'I foresaw the Lord'; also 4²⁶ 7³³.

Ac 15¹⁷ 'That men might seek after the Lord.'

2. In phrases, such as—

Ac 3¹⁹ 'Times of refreshing from the presence of the Lord.'

Ac 10³³ 'Things commanded thee of the Lord.'

The question of the reference in several of the instances in this whole section (II.) is doubtful. The following notes explain why the reference has been decided as above.

The phrases of O.T. origin, which are given in (II. a 2), with one exception (7³¹), appear also in Luke's Gospel. In the Gospel the reference to God is undoubted, and must be adopted here, even though (in 11²¹) it compels us to find a reference to Jesus in the title δ Κύριος in the same verse.

Ac i. 24, 'Lord—show whether of these twain Thou hast chosen.'—Bengel, Rendall, and Knowling ('probably') say that the reference is to Jesus. We have no doubt whatever that prayer was offered to Jesus in the early Church, but we incline to the opinion of Weiss that in this instance it is addressed to God. The application to Jesus is justified by the facts: (1) that the calling of apostles is His work (cf. also the call of Paul); (2) that the same words 'show' ($\alpha\nu\acute{\alpha}\delta\epsilon\iota\chi\omicron\nu$) are used in Lk 10¹ in connexion with the appointment of the Seventy, and 'chosen' ($\epsilon\chi\epsilon\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\xi\omega$) in connexion with the call of the Twelve (Lk 6¹³); (3) that in Acts we have the continuation of what Jesus began to do and teach. On the other hand, we have to notice that Peter, who is the speaker here, applies the same attribute, 'Who knowest the hearts' (δ $\text{καρδιογ\acute{\omega}\nu\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma}$), to God in Ac 15⁸; (2) that he also says, 'God has made choice ($\epsilon\chi\epsilon\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\xi\alpha\tau\omicron$) among us, that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the Gospel' (15⁷); (3) that the use of the lot in the history of Israel was invariably and necessarily an appeal to God; (4) while it is admitted that the aim of Luke was to continue the record of the works of Jesus, it must not be concluded that that was the point of view of those whose words or actions he relates, or possibly of those who compiled the sources which he used in the first part of Acts. That it was not Peter's point of view is evident from 2⁸⁹ 11¹⁷ 15⁷.

Ac xv. 17, 'That—men might seek after the Lord.'—The quotation is from Am 9¹², but the words δ κύριος are not found in the Hebrew or the LXX. They have been inserted by James. In this case the context helps us. In v. 17 the quotation runs, 'the residue of men and all the

Gentiles on whom my name is called, saith (the) Lord.' In v¹⁹, James says, 'My sentence is that we trouble not them that from among the Gentiles are turned to God' (see also vv. 14, 18). James keeps to the Jewish standpoint. We follow Rendall in referring this title (Ac 15¹⁷) to God.

Ac x. 33, 'The things commanded thee of the Lord.'—Cornelius could have no knowledge of Jesus, under this name, at this stage. The reading of the Textus Receptus 'God,' though it is rejected by T., W.H., and Nestle, exactly agrees with the religious knowledge of Cornelius when he speaks to Peter. If the rejected reading is not the correct one, it is possible that in this part of Acts we have a translation from an Aramaic original, and that the title δ Κύριος is due to Luke. Rendall adopts the reference to God in this passage.

III. Κύριος and δ Κύριος , as titles of reverence, or as expressive of faith, addressed or applied to Jesus.

(a) Κύριος —

Ac 1⁶ 'Lord wilt Thou—restore the kingdom?' also 7^{59, 60} 9¹³ 22¹⁹.

Ac 2²⁰ 'The great day of (the) Lord.'

Ac 2²¹ 'The name of the Lord.'

Ac 2³⁶ 'Made Him both Lord and Christ.'

Ac 9⁵ 'Who art Thou, Lord?' also 9¹⁰ 22^{8, 10} 26¹⁵.

Ac 10³⁶ 'He is Lord of all.'

(β) δ Κύριος —

1. Used by itself where the reference is clear.

Ac 5¹⁴ 'Believers in the Lord'; also in 30 other places.¹

2. Used by itself where the reference may be doubted.

Ac 8²⁵ 'Preached the word of the Lord'; also 13⁴⁴ (where Weiss and W.H. prefer 'God.' The reading adopted is that of T., Nestle, and the margin of the R.V.) 13⁴⁸ (where W.H. again reads 'God,' but T., Nestle, and R.V. margin read 'Lord') 13⁴⁹ 15^{35, 36} 16³² (where Weiss and W.H. read 'God,' but T., Nestle, and R.V. margin 'Lord') 19¹⁰ (where T., W.H., Weiss, and Blass omit 'Jesus').

Ac 8^{22, 24} 'Beseech the Lord.'

Ac 12¹¹ 'The Lord sent His angel.'

Ac 12¹⁷ 'The Lord led him out of prison.'

Ac 18² 'Serving the Lord.'

Ac 18²⁵ 'Instructed in the way of the Lord.'

Ac 20²⁸ 'The Church of the Lord.'

Ac 20³² 'I commend you to the Lord' (Weiss and W.H. read 'Lord,' T., Nestle, R.V. margin 'God').

¹ Ac 2^{34, 47} 9^{1, 10, 11, 15, 27, 28, 31, 35, 42} 11^{16, 21, 23, 24} 13^{12, 47} 14^{3, 23} 15⁴⁰ 16^{14, 15} 18^{8, 9} 19²⁰ 20¹⁹ 21¹⁴ 22¹⁴ 23¹¹ 26¹⁵.

3. Used in conjunction with the name Jesus.

Ac 4³³ 'The apostles of the Lord Jesus'; also 8¹⁶ 11²⁰, 15¹¹ (where T., W.H. omit Χριστός) 16³¹, 19⁵ (where T., W.H. omit X') 19^{15, 17}, 20²¹ (W.H. and Weiss omit X') 20^{24, 35} 21¹⁸.

Ac 9¹⁷ 'The Lord, even Jesus.'

4. Used in conjunction with the names Jesus Christ.

Ac 11¹⁷ 'Believe on the name of the Lord Jesus Christ.'

Ac 15²⁸ 'On behalf of the name of our Lord Jesus Christ.'

Ac 28³¹ 'The things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ.'

Ac ii. 20, 21.—The reference in these two cases is exceedingly doubtful. In the O.T., whence they are quoted, there is no doubt. The reference there is to God. All that we can say is that in Acts it is more likely that it is to Jesus. The whole passage which is quoted is regarded as a prophecy which had been fulfilled on the day of Pentecost (22-26). 'In the Epistles of the N.T. the phrase "day of (the) Lord" is constantly applied to the coming of Jesus in judgment' (Sabatier, *Paul the Apostle*, p. 104). It is not improbable that the same application was made in Acts. The second coming was regarded as imminent (see 3¹⁹⁻²¹). As to the other phrase, 'the name of the Lord,' the emphasis which is laid on the name of Jesus, especially in the speeches of Peter in the early chapters of Acts, strongly confirms the opinion that reference is made to Him here. Cf. 2³⁸ 'Repent and be baptized . . . in the name of Jesus'; 4¹² 'There is none other name given among men, whereby we must be saved'; also 3⁶⁻¹⁶ 4¹⁰ 5⁴¹, etc. 'The early Christians did not hesitate to refer to Him (Jesus) the attributes and prophecies which the prophets of Israel had associated with the name of God' (Knowling, *Expositor's Greek Testament*, vol. ii., *in loco*). 'Jesus assumed in the consciousness of the apostles the place which God held in the consciousness of the prophets' (Sabatier). Beyschlag adopts the reference to Jesus (*N.T. Theology*, vol. i. 315).

Ac x. 36.—'He is Lord of all.' Great difficulty has been found in the interpretation of this clause in the speech of Peter. Blass suggests leaving out the word Κύριος altogether. But that is an expedient of despair. It merely cuts the knot. It fails to explain why Κύριος should ever have been inserted. It gives us an easier reading in place of one that is difficult. The whole verse runs, 'The word which He sent unto the children of Israel, preaching peace by Jesus Christ (He is Lord of all)—that saying ye yourselves know.' The words 'He is Lord of all' are printed in brackets in the

A.V. and R.V. They are evidently explanatory. But what do they explain? The only reason why Peter should have added this little clause was, that *for the first time* he was speaking about Jesus Christ to a Gentile—a proselyte no doubt, but still a Gentile. He had no way of knowing at the moment the extent of the acquaintance of Cornelius with the Messianic hopes of the Jews. Is it not possible that the little clause was added to interpret or explain to Cornelius the meaning of the title 'Christ'? Cf. Ac 2³⁶, 'God hath made this same Jesus—both Lord and Christ.' In the O.T. the phrase, 'the Anointed of the Lord' (ὁ Χριστὸς τοῦ Κυρίου), was often used of the kings of Israel (1 S 2¹⁰⁻³⁵, 2 S 1¹⁴, Ps 2²), and was used by Luke in the Gospel (2²⁶ 9²⁰), and in Ac 4²⁶, as indicating that Jesus was the expected Messianic King. It expresses the idea of Lordship, and to a Gentile no better equivalent could be found for 'Christ' than 'Lord.' To the Jews He was Jesus the Christ, to the Gentiles He was Jesus the Lord. 'Christ' and 'Lord' in reference to both are confessional. Cf. in relation to Jews, 'baptized in the name of Jesus Christ' (Ac 2³⁸; also 3⁶ 3²⁰ 4¹⁰ 17³ 24²⁴). Only in two cases is Jesus referred to as Christ in connexion with Gentiles (10⁴⁸ 16¹⁸). A rejected reading found in (10⁴⁸) the Textus Receptus, for which much might be said, would, if adopted, reduce the exceptions to one. In relation to Gentiles, cf. 'exhorted them . . . to cleave unto the Lord' (11²³); 'commended them unto the Lord on whom they had believed' (14²³); also 11²⁰⁻²¹ 13^{12, 48, 49} 16³¹ (where T., W.H., Nestle, and R.V. omit 'Christ'). The exceptions to this rule are more frequent in relation to the Gentiles, as is to be expected, since in most of the Gentile Churches there was a considerable number of Jews. That there was a distinction in the presentation of the Saviour to the Jews and Gentiles in the record of Acts, is sufficiently proved from the instances quoted. One other suggestion may be made in connexion with this little phrase, 'He is Lord of all,' namely, that it was Peter who was first led to use the title 'Lord' as an equivalent for 'Christ.' Certainly there was no need for using any such equivalent until the preachers of the gospel came into contact with the Gentile world, and it is very significant that Peter uses it exactly at that moment.

The new religion which was to conquer the world adapted itself to the first necessity of a universal religion. It must not have a national or

Jewish name for the Saviour whom it proclaimed. It must not offer a 'Messiah' to those who were not Jews. As the LXX in the wider movement of Judaism adopted the general title *κύριος* (LORD) for the particular or Jewish names of God, so Christianity at the very beginning of its world-wide conquest, made a similar adaptation to the new conditions. It is this principle which explains the use of 'Lord' as the equivalent for 'Christ' in Ac 20²⁸. It also accounts for the early use of 'Christ' as a personal name.

The fact that the Gospels and Acts were written later than the time when the preaching to the Gentiles led to the translation of 'Christ' into its Gentile equivalent, accounts for the use of the Gentile equivalent in narratives which deal with events which took place prior to that new departure. At the time when they were written the titles *Κύριος* and *ὁ Κύριος*, as applied to Jesus, were familiar, and the historians or the translators employed them without recognizing that their use of them was at times an anachronism. The declarations also in Lk 2¹¹ and Ac 2³⁶ that Jesus is 'Christ the Lord' and 'both Lord and Christ' may be accounted for in this way. Lk uses in the narratives the combination of the confessional titles of Jew and Gentile, before the time when the Gentile equivalent had become necessary. Undoubtedly the source of the Gentile equivalent is the LXX, and especially Ps 110¹, and our Lord's own application of that prophetic word to Himself. Peter also quotes the psalm in Ac 2³⁴, and this makes it all the more likely that it was he who was led to give this familiar equivalent for 'Christ.'

Ac viii. 25.—The doubt as to the reference arises mainly from the uncertainty of the reading. According to the critical authorities there are (including 12²⁴, with T., Nestle, and R.V.) eleven places where the gospel is described as 'the word of God,' and eight where it is described as 'the word of the Lord.' It is, however, to be remarked that the phrase, 'word of the Lord,' is generally used in the record of preaching to the Gentiles, and 'word of God' in the record of preaching to Jews. The question of the reference in these passages is of little importance, except that the description of the gospel in this twofold manner may possibly have arisen from the practical identification of Jesus with God.

Ac viii. 22, 24.—The alternative reading in 8²² is *Θεός*, but it is not well supported. The

question of the reference is not determined by the reading. It is almost impossible that Peter should say in 8²¹ 'thy heart is not right with God,' and in the same breath (8²²) say 'beseech the Lord,' if he had not intended that the reference was different, and that Simon should pray to Jesus. Simon, in his reply, repeats the words of Peter, asking him to pray to the Lord for him. He might not have made this request if Peter had bidden him pray to God. Prayer to Jesus was unfamiliar to him. W.H. and Knowling adopt the reference to Jesus. Probably Peter spoke in Aramaic and referred to Jesus, and Luke translated the reference accordingly.

Ac xii. 11, 17.—The explanation given immediately above explains the reference here. Most likely in the Aramaic original of the first part of Acts (which is the theory of Nestle and Blass) the reference was to Jesus, and Luke has translated accordingly; for, according to the opinion already expressed, the use of the title 'Lord' was not in use among the disciples until after the beginning of the preaching to the Gentiles.

Ac xiii. 2.—The doubt as to the reference can only arise where there is the idea that service such as is described in the word *λειτουργέω* could not be offered to Jesus. In the O.T. it describes the work of the priests and levites in the temple and tabernacle. The idea which the word expresses is that of 'consecrated service.' It may include worship. For other forms of service, compare Ro 15²⁷, 'their duty is also to minister to them in carnal things.'

Ac xviii. 25.—'Instructed in the way of the Lord.' The reading is accepted by T., W.H., Nestle, and R.V. W.H. also indicates that the reference is to Jesus. The uncertainty arises from the occurrence of the phrase, 'the way of God,' in the following verse. The distinction of phrase, in passages so close together, implies a distinction of reference, or practical identification of God with Jesus. The way of God and the way of the Lord are the same, and the man who was instructed in the 'way of the Lord' has 'the way of God' expounded to him more perfectly (18²⁶).

Ac xx. 28.—It is only the reading that is uncertain. The MSS evidence is almost equally balanced. W.H., Nestle, Rendall, the A.V., and R.V. read 'Church of God,' following MSS *αβ*. Blass, Page, T., and R.V. margin read 'Church of the Lord,' following ACDE. 'The Church of God' is familiar in the Epistles of Paul,

where it is found ten times. The phrase, 'Church of the Lord,' is unique. It is more likely that the strange phrase, 'Church of the Lord,' was altered to a phrase which was familiar, than *vice versa*.

Ac xx. 32.—Again it is the reading that is uncertain. W.H., Weiss, R.V. margin read 'Lord'; T., Nestle, Rendall read 'God.' In support of the reading adopted, we may refer to 14²³, where Paul and Barnabas commend disciples 'to the Lord on whom they had believed.'

Ac iv. 33.—The name 'Lord Jesus' is found more frequently in critical editions of Acts than in the Textus Receptus. Most likely, in the first part of Acts (1-12), its occurrence is due to Luke. According to our theory, the title 'Lord' was not adopted until after the gospel was preached to the Gentiles.

Ac ix. 17.—'The Lord, even Jesus.' In the Greek the word 'Lord' is in a peculiar position. Most likely it is an addition by Luke or some copyist.

Ac xi. 17, xv. 26, xxviii. 12.—It is to be noted that the full title, 'the Lord Jesus Christ,' which is so familiar to us, is used in the narrative in connexion with the questions that arose from the preaching of the gospel to the Gentiles (11¹⁷ 15²⁶). There is a peculiar fitness in the combination of the Jewish and Gentile confessional titles in the places where it occurs. It has also a fitting place in the concluding verse of the Acts. To regard the full title as arising in this way gives it a new significance. The name of Jesus stands enshrined within the Gentile and Jewish confessional titles—**Lord Jesus Christ.**

Recent Foreign Theology.

Tiele's Outlines of the Science of Religion.¹

THESE 'Outlines of the Science of Religion' are published as one of a series of short popular works on theology and the history of religion, by J. C. B. Mohr of Tübingen and Leipzig. The translation from Dutch into German was entrusted by Dr. Tiele to Mr. G. Gehrich, Pastor in Stellichte (Hannover). These 'Outlines' are really a series of short paragraphs which Dr. Tiele supplied to the pupils attending his lectures as forming the basis of his lectures. Dr. Tiele calls especial attention to the fact that they provide not only a summary of his Gifford Lectures, but a supplement to them, inasmuch as many points are here touched on which he had to pass by in silence at Edinburgh. They are, we may say at once, indeed a most important supplement, and their value can hardly be overestimated. Religion is 'everything whereby man expresses his belief in a superhuman power, everything he does to maintain his relation to that power.' Religion is not merely universal amongst men, but 'the elements of which it is composed are in all times and places

essentially the same.' There is an evolution of religion, and it is 'the work of the human spirit striving to find a suitable and complete expression for the religious idea as it grows more and more clear.' The history of mankind as a whole testifies to the steady advance of religious evolution or development. The motive power of this advance is, whether consciously or unconsciously, the force of personality or individuality. That force science may analyse or classify, but cannot explain. Particular religions may decay and disappear, but 'the temporary and transient forms of religion are not to be confused with religion itself.' The factors in religious evolution are the unconscious tendency to variation (which is, as we know, the 'origin of species'), and the conscious reflexion of religious minds on the variations which thus tend to arise (*i.e.* we presume a process of 'selection'). The religious basis of polytheism is the recognition of the divine in all its manifestations; of monotheism, the conviction that the God who reveals Himself in all these manifestations is the only God and is my God: 'it is in the harmonizing of these two ideas that the theology of the future lies.' As to the belief in another world, it is, in its religious essence, 'the belief in the reality of the Infinite, in the existence of a spiritual world which is at once the reflex and the perfection of the phenomenal

¹ *Grundzüge der Religionswissenschaft.* By the late Dr. Tiele. Authorized German Translation. London: Williams & Norgate. Price 2s. net.

world.' An essential element in religion is 'the conviction that the Infinite in us, and of which we are conscious, is not essentially different from the Infinite around us, but inseparably related to it.' If, then, the conviction and the consciousness of man's relation to the Infinite is of the essence of religion, man cannot be a merely finite being—'the spark of divinity in him cannot be extinguished: if his calling is to strive after the highest perfection, then an endless existence is postulated for him.' On the perversions of the religious instinct Dr. Tiele speaks out boldly: 'Such pathological phenomena of religion as Intellectualism, Theosophy, and Orthodoxy, if their development is not checked, involve the most fatal consequences for religious, moral, and social life, and in any case transform religion from a unifying power into a cause of hatred and dissension.' The perverse tendency to make of religion nothing but a cult brings, 'as its lamentable consequences, Ritualism, Formalism, Pharisaism.' If we start from the idea that 'the Church is religion and outside my Church is no salvation, then Clericalism, Intolerance, and Bigotry develop as so many symptoms of disease in religious life.' F. B. JEVONS.

Durham.

The Reform of the Lord's Supper.¹

IN these Letters the writer addresses a layman for whom the Sacrament has no attractions, on account of the difficulty of forming positive conceptions regarding it from a modern view point. Ever since the Aufklärung, the Sacrament has in many quarters occupied a very subordinate place, instead of constituting, as it did formerly and still should do, the highest point of Christian worship. Starting from the assertion in the Lutheran Catechism that in the Sacrament of the Altar the true Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ is partaken of, Bassermann seeks to eliminate gross conceptions of what is meant by sacramental eating and drinking, and by substituting 'mensch' for 'flesh and blood,' arrives at the idea of *appropriating the personal Christ*. We appropriate Christ by having a picture of Him in the mind; and

¹ *On the Reform of the Lord's Supper: Letters to a Layman.* By D. Heinrich Bassermann. Tübingen and Leipzig: Möhr, 1904; London: Williams & Norgate.

in the Sacrament we have a pictorial representation of Christ. But Christ is more than an historical picture. He is a living Person whose Presence is felt amongst us. The 'remembrance' of Christ in the Supper is the commemoration of One who performs a redeeming work through His accomplished sacrifice and His present grace. On what does the working of the Sacrament depend subjectively? On the disposition of the soul, its sense of a need of forgiveness, and its consciousness that forgiveness has been mediated through Christ.

Our author next gives us his views of 1 Co II, and contends that the prevailing note of the primitive Lord's Supper was eucharistic. If there be doubt about the authenticity of the command, 'This do in remembrance of me,' Bassermann waives the need of any such command, and bases the worth of the Supper upon psychological needs. The need justifies the custom. The last four letters deal with certain reforms in the manner of celebration. Greater brevity and concentration are called for. The rite should not be a mere appendix to the usual service, but should be made the chief constituent of the service on the occasions on which there is celebration. The sermon should be brief and deal directly with some aspect of the Supper. The final letter is concerned with revulsion from the Sacrament, due to disgust at the common cup. Professor Bassermann finds only two possible remedies—though he does not seem attracted to either—the individual cup, and the denial of it to the laity. The former method sacrifices the commendable custom whereby communicants divide the cup among themselves; and the restriction to communion in one kind is a disability which must never again be endured.

Helpful, no doubt to the German layman for whom it is written, this brochure cannot be said to contain much that is fresh. But it is interesting to us as an indication of the fact that the present quickening of belief in subliminal influences is accompanied by a revival of interest in the Sacraments as media for the communication of such influences. It also shows that a rich doctrine of the Eucharist may be held by those who share the free opinions in New Testament criticism entertained by Professor Bassermann.

ROBERT M. ADAMSON.

St. John's Manse, Ardrossan.

The Ethical Ideal of Christianity.¹

THE reader is tempted at first to regard this work as an enlargement of *Das Lehrstück v. d. 7 Hauptsünden* (1893), in the same way as the author's *Askese u. Mönchtum* was an enlargement of the earlier *Kritischen Geschichte der Askese* (1863). Such a view is not just. The present work, although it includes the history of the Catholic doctrine of the Seven Deadly Sins, is a much larger study. It is, in fact, an attempt, perhaps the first that has been made, to apply the methods of historical criticism to the study of Christian moral teaching. The first part of the book is occupied in tracing the formation of the two groups of seven sins and seven virtues which played so great a part in the preaching, art, and poetry of the Middle Ages. The study is one of great interest, and Professor Zöckler's immense erudition leaves us confident that no stage of the development is left unchronicled. The problem which these two groups of seven present to the thoughtful mind is twofold. We ask why the number seven was fixed upon in preference to any other? And why are the contents of the lists just what they are? In the case of the catalogue of virtues, both questions seem to admit of an obvious answer. Christian consciousness was early attracted by the symmetry of the Pauline triad, 'Faith, Hope, Love.' There was also a desire, evident in the writings of Church teachers from Athenagoras downwards, and especially remarkable in St. Ambrose and St. Augustine, to bring Christian ethical teaching into connexion with the classical tetrad of virtues. The simple addition of the Pauline three to the Platonic four would fix at once the number of members and the contents of the list. This is simple, but like many another obvious explanation of fact, is unsatisfactory to the thoughtful student of history. The septad of virtues was not fixed until the time of the schoolmen—Peter Lombard was the first who authorized the catalogue. Why should there have been this delay in performing the obvious addition of three to four? Professor Zöckler's explanation is one of the most valuable things in his book. He shows the feeling which existed in early times, and never entirely disappeared, that the Pauline 'Faith, Hope, and Charity' were

different in kind from the classical virtues. Men shrank, as if from a certain irreverence, from grouping them together. It required all the passion for systematizing which possessed the schoolmen, and all the curious fascination of the number seven, to bring to the birth Peter Lombard's list.

Indeed, the fact that seven was fixed upon as the number of the virtues, was to a large extent due to the desire to bring them into line with the vices, whose sevenfold list was already 500 years old when Peter Lombard enunciated the catalogue of virtues. In explaining the number of the deadly sins Professor Zöckler falls back on the fascination of the number seven (*der Zauber der Siebenzahl*) for the Western mind. For the first catalogues of sins—those of Evagrius and Nilus—consisted of eight members and not seven, nor were these lists ever superseded in the East. It was Gregory the Great who reduced the number to seven, and his work never obtained recognition except in the West. Professor Zöckler says that he effected the change by setting aside two sets of doublets—uniting Tristitia with Akeidia and Superbia with Inanis Gloria—but is this quite accurate? Gregory gave Superbia a place by itself outside the catalogue as *Regina vitiorum* and *Radix cuncti mali*. It remains distinct from Inanis Gloria—the first of the *Duces exercitus malorum*. Nor can it be said that he unites Tristitia and Akeidia. He does not mention the latter vice at all, and the former apparently retains the meaning it had in Cassian. The number seven was then arrived at by the addition of a new vice—Invidia.

The question about the contents of the list is a puzzling one. Some sins which seem fairly obvious and deadly enough—e.g. hypocrisy and lying—find no place in either the Evagrian or Gregorian list, or are dragged in with difficulty as 'soldiers' of one or other of the commanding seven. It is just here that the book seems to me least satisfactory. With all his extended knowledge of the literature, the author has failed in sympathy with these earnest strivers after holiness, who wrought out lists of dangers from the material furnished by their own acute spiritual introspection. It may be that such an analysis of the list from the inside was foreign to Professor Zöckler's plan, and we certainly owe him thanks for providing a complete guide to the materials on which such an examina-

¹ *Die Tugendlehre des Christentums*. Von Otto Zöckler. Gütersloh, 1904. Pp. xii, 379.

tion of the list must be based. At the same time, we cannot but regret that the learned author himself has not given us something more than a mere reference to the teaching of the later Stoics as explanation of the selection of the particular seven which make up the number of the deadly sins.

The next section of the book deals with the ethical teaching of the mystics—Greek and Latin. The reader may perhaps be tempted to wish that Professor Zöckler had given the history, which he half promises, of the idea of a literal imitation of Christ. It appears as a motive for the ascetic life in the Pseudo-Clementine Epistles to Virgins, in Origen, in the literature of Egyptian monasticism, and in St. Basil's ascetic writings. No doubt, however, the author was right in turning from this tempting path and tracing instead the development of the idea of grades in virtue (*scala Dei*), of which the most familiar example meets us in the *Regula S. Benedicti*. This conception of the heavenly ladder, with its constant references to Jacob's dream, is of the utmost importance in mediæval mysticism.

The length to which this review has already run forbids more than a mere mention of the two remaining sections of the book. The one, which is full of curious information, deals with the expressions which the Catholic system of vices and virtues found in the preaching, poetry, drama, and art of the Middle Ages. The other will perhaps be the most generally interesting in the book. It describes the Protestant, modern Roman Catholic, and the latest philosophic teaching about virtue. The whole concludes with Professor Zöckler's weightily expressed conviction that the only durable basis for a system of Christian morality must be sought in the Decalogue, interpreted in the light of the Gospel.

A single review can do but scant justice to a book like this. In the copiousness of the learning displayed, in the far-seeing accuracy of the arrangement, and in the originality of its thought, the book is a great one. *Die Tugendlehre des Christentums* should be read by every student of Christian history, and it is to be hoped that some publisher will see his way to arrange for the production of an English translation.

JAMES O. HANNAY.

Westport.

The Restoration of Aix Cathedral.¹

WE suppose there never was a 'restoration' of an ancient building that did not rouse the voice of protest; and it is safe to say that in the majority of cases the protesters have had the best of the argument. We have much sympathy with the view of the author before us who 'for his own part would never think of restoration,' and who holds in general that in art 'we should do that precisely and only which lies in our blood,' and that the care of each generation with regard to ancient monuments should be spent in 'preserving what is old in its genuine purity.' This pamphlet, however, is more than a protest against the restoration, or rather the 'deformation,' of the great Cathedral-tomb of Charlemagne at Aix-la-Chapelle; and in being much more it is finely characteristic of Germany. Here, a protester in similar circumstances would write to the *Times*; there, his protest becomes a book of 100 large octavo pages—just as if it were about a matter of public consequence like Tariff Reform!—and of these pages more than a half are occupied with a careful and competent and fully illustrated discussion of the historic origins of the art in question, without any reference to the offences of the restorers. It is an interesting example of the higher criticism, which is as busy, sometimes as revolutionary, often as fruitful, and altogether as necessary, in art as it is in the study of the Bible.

Here the author applies the conclusions of his larger work, lately published, *Kleinasien, ein Neuland der Kunstgeschichte*, to the Aix Cathedral. His main positions are: that historical inquiry into the origins of the Gallo-Frankish art of the Carolingian age, of which the Cathedral is the greatest example, has for long been led into a 'blind alley' by these origins being looked for only in Rome and Ravenna; that the main motives of the Northern art of that period came from the East, from Hellenistic and early Christian influences in Egypt, Asia Minor, and the Farther East, to Northern Europe by Marseilles; that Charlemagne found a living art in practice in his own country, and was the means of giving to it a strongly national character; that it took then gradually that form which we call the Romanesque style;

¹ *Der Dom zu Aachen und seine Entstehung: ein kunstwissenschaftlicher Protest.* Von Jos. Strzygowski. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung. Price M. 1.

and that the extensive and costly 'restoration' now proceeding of the Minster, which is 'the most important evidence for the nature of the oldest Christian art in Germany,' is thoroughly vitiated by ignorance and prejudice on the part of the authorities, with the melancholy result that 'the individuality of an historical monument' is being destroyed, and 'the old and venerable Cathedral of Charlemagne has become the theatre for the exploits of a modern artist.'

The brochure will be chiefly interesting, out of Germany at least, not for its protest, in which indeed the author is not at all hopeful of success, but for its positive arguments for a fresh view of an obscure and perplexing department of the history of art. It is admirably illustrated with plans and photographs.

JOHN D. SINCLAIR.

Cluny, Aberdeenshire.

Early Christianity after Historical Criticism.¹

In the present author a new star of considerable magnitude has risen above the horizon. His larger work, discussing the moral conditions of the primitive Christian Churches, and giving ample evidence of wide learning and brilliant ability, will soon appear in English. The present slighter work is marked by the same qualities. While belonging to the advanced critical school, the author finally approaches the old positions to a far greater extent than most members of the school. He may be not inaptly described as a mediator between the old and the new school. Throughout the present work there is a running protest against the extreme views and extremest assertions of Wernle's work, which is also appearing in English dress.

A main purpose of the present work is to describe the change which the historical method of inquiry has made in our views of the events and development of early Christianity. But while faithful to this method and defending its conclusions in contrast with old 'dogmatic' views, the author seldom omits to utter a warning against the dangers and extravagances of the modern school.

¹ *Probleme des apostolischen Zeitalters*. Fünf Vorträge in Hannover im Oktober 1903 gehalten. Von Ernst von Dobschütz. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1904. Mk.2.70, geb. 3.60.

After handling the text of the Acts and Epistles with very great freedom, he often surprises us by the slight change in the result arrived at. Thus, we are told that from the Acts we get the impression that Paul was 'the Gentile missionary.' Then we are reminded that Peter, Stephen, Barnabas and others worked in the same way. Still these qualifying facts are taken from the Acts, so that any misunderstanding is more our fault than the fault of the history. It is added, 'This does not impeach the world-wide significance of Paul.' The same mediating spirit is seen in the view taken of the Johannine question. The author ascribes the Fourth Gospel to the Presbyter John, who is distinguished from the apostle; but, in order to account for the strong Jewish colouring of the Gospel, it is assumed that the writer must have been long resident in Palestine and then emigrated to Asia Minor.

An admirable feature in the entire work is the energy with which the writer emphasizes the original, unique elements in early Christianity. In this respect the work is a timely and powerful protest against the persistent attempts of many writers to obliterate all that is distinctive in Christianity, making it at best a superior Judaism. Of Jewish Christianity in the very earliest days he writes: 'Although in detail many of the special opinions and practices may bear a very strong Jewish taint (against the spirit of Jesus), it was in point of fact a new thing, new from the centre; a new relation to God was gained, a new estimate of sin and forgiveness, a new conception of life and its duties. We have Jewish Christianity, not Christian Judaism.'

The chief gain of the historical method is that it gives a more natural and human aspect to the past. The Reformation theologians treated Paul as if he were one of themselves. More recent writers do the same. 'In Neander and Godet, Paul is a pectoral theologian, in Rückert a pious supernaturalist, in Baur a Hegelian, in Luthardt orthodox, in Ritschl a genuine Ritschlian.' The reaction against this exaggerates the points in which early Christianity differs from our days. If we are to believe some writers, its essence lay in the abnormal, in visions, ecstasies, asceticism. Our author enters a caveat against this exaggeration. We need to remember that the moral force of early Christianity was its distinctive feature. This was what impressed beholders and won converts.

'The essential element in Christianity was the certainty, and the moral force connected therewith, going forth from the gospel, which made men different men.' 'The greatest thing in Paul is that he succeeded in raising the Gentile churches gathered by him in part from the most corrupt strata of heathenism to the height of evangelical piety and morality.'

The five problems discussed are the Rise of the Primitive Church, Jewish Christianity and Judaism, Gentile Christianity and Heathenism, Jewish and Gentile Christianity, Primitive Christianity and Catholicism. Each problem raises a number of subsidiary questions. The various solutions proposed are briefly but clearly sketched. In fact, the work is a historical survey of modern opinion on the different subjects, with criticism of the most recent writers and their works. Many who do not share the author's critical position will profit by his broad luminous expositions. J. S. BANKS.

Leeds.

A Discovery in the History of the New Testament Text.¹

THIS most scholarly edition of a Minuscule of the Bibliothèque Nationale is an indirect result of Freiherr von Soden's remarkable enterprise in the textual criticism of the New Testament. Schmidtke was impressed by the importance of its text while occupied with the examination of N.T. MSS in Paris for von Soden. Its value, however, had been already noted by the learned Abbé Martin.

The MS. (gr. 97 of the Bibl. Nat.) appears to have been prepared about the middle of the thirteenth century at the request of a certain Abbess Olympias. Schmidtke assigns its home to Egypt. Its text reveals an interesting phenomenon. That of *Matthew* represents the common text. The other Gospels, which are remarkable for an extraordinary mass of errors in grammar, spelling, and sense, seem to have been dictated from an ancient Uncial, hard to decipher, to a copyist of inferior education and capacity. From an investigation of its characteristics the editor would place its date in the fifth century. This text, which he designates Ol (from Olympias), is akin to the

celebrated group $\text{B}\kappa\text{C}\text{L}\Delta\Psi$ 33 892. That group Schmidtke (following Bousset, *Textkritische Studien zum N.T.*, pp. 74-110) regards as representing the recension of the Egyptian bishop Hesychius, which became the Vulgate of the Egyptian Church. The Vatican MS. B is probably the most faithful witness of the recension. And from the agreement of Ol with B in a number of rare readings and isolated peculiarities, Schmidtke infers 'the identity of a near predecessor of B with an ancestor of Ol.' A specially noteworthy feature of Ol is the close connexion between its division of the Gospels into paragraphs or sections and that found in B and Ξ . Traces of the same method appear also in κ . So that Schmidtke regards it as an idiosyncrasy of the Hesychian group of texts. In the attempt to discover the principles which determined this scheme of division, our author, after a careful examination of the evidence, reaches the conclusion that 'Hesychius adopted the chapters and synoptical subdivisions of a work embracing Matthew with parallels, and in imitation of this model split up the three remaining Gospels into chapters, and, so far as was necessary in the case of portions not accompanied by Matthew, into subdivisions, although in the latter he did not give effect to the synoptical intention of his model' (p. xxxii). Now we know from Eusebius that a fellow-countryman of Hesychius, Ammonius, prepared a synopsis which answers precisely to this description.

The hypothesis which Schmidtke has put forward is certainly a most attractive one, and, if established, forms an important discovery in the history of the New Testament text. For if we find a part of the work of Ammonius preserved in Ol and B, texts which there is every reason for assigning to the Hesychian recension, the question naturally arises, Is it not probable that Hesychius will have used the ancient text, which is the basis of the Ammonian *Diatessaron*, as a leading authority for his own Harmony of the Gospels? Schmidtke sheds some light on this problem by bringing forward certain considerations to show that the text of Hesychius differs in Matthew and those sections of the other Gospels which are parallel to Matthew, from that which he has followed in the remaining portions of his *τετραεὐάγγελον*.

To sum up, it may be said with justice that Schmidtke's introduction to the texts of Mark,

¹ *Die Evangelien eines alten Unzialcodex (B*-Text)*. Nach einer Abschrift d. 13ten Jahrhunderts herausgegeben v. A. Schmidtke. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1903. Pp. xl, 116. Price M.4.

Luke, and John, which are here printed in full from the MS., is an admirable example of the results to be gained from the patient investigation of a single obscure text by a thoroughly scientific and acute observer. H. A. A. KENNEDY.

Callander.

The Cult of Attis.¹

IN some of the most brilliant pages of Dr. Har-nack's latest book, *Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten*, he shows that while early Christianity combated the early Polytheism and the immorality which was inextricably interwoven with it, it had a still stronger foe to overcome. This was a curious pagan Syncretism, which was called Orientalism by Tacitus and by Juvenal, and which is continually referred to by Greek writers as 'the Eastern Religious Philosophy.' Under this indefinite name was included a strange medley of cults, both rites and teaching, of religious and even of scientific speculations. Its origin is not far to seek. Ever since the days when Alexander the Great destroyed the old Greek City-States, and by his conquests united the East and the West in a way previously unknown, there had been a wonderful mingling of nationalities in all the countries on the eastern shores of the Mediterranean. The formation and continuance of the Empire under Augustus and his successors increased this growing cosmopolitanism. This mingling of peoples meant a mutual knowledge of their several religions, and the coming in contact with a great variety of new thoughts on religion; it was greatest in Syria and in Egypt with their capitals Antioch and Alexandria. This formed the base of a religious pagan eclecticism. The innumerable new thoughts and religious practices were laid hold on by the Greek intellect, which applied to them its subtle powers of speculation, and there resulted this 'Eastern Religious Philosophy.'

We do not know definitely very much about it. But one or two things seem clear. It retained as part of its teaching the traditional mythology, and professed to put new life into the old realist stories by impregnating them with ideas in somewhat the same fashion, we may sup-

¹ *Attis, seine mythen und sein kult.* By Hugo Hepding. Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann, 1903 (January 1904). Price 5s.

pose, as modern intellectual Hinduism treats its old mythology. But the constant tendency which myths have to change, and the difficulty of knowing what the ideas were which the myths were supposed to embody, makes the whole subject very obscure. On the other hand it appears clear, both from contemporary descriptions and from the evidence of the cultus rites, that this pagan Syncretism taught, in a more or less vivid way, ideas which are not to be found in the public religions of Greece and of Rome—the idea that the soul is distinct from and superior to the body, and with this a very definite sense of immortality; the idea that God is not vaguely one with the Universe, but to be distinctly separated from it; a sense of sin and therefore a need of expiation and salvation; that for salvation something more than wisdom was needed, that an active divine assistance was necessary. To these ideas, which are commonly given, I would add, a sense that there is a 'household of the faith' formed of all the initiated 'brethren and sisters.' Nor are we to imagine that these ideas were the portion of the cultivated classes only. The Oriental religions which fed this 'Eastern Religious Philosophy' made their way at first among the lower strata of the population, among the very classes from which Christianity was most largely recruited. Later they permeated the whole of society. Men and women, impelled by a restless quest after salvation, became members of many religious confraternities, and were initiated into the most varied cults. Thus, to take one instance, we have on the tombstone of a Roman lady who lived in the fifth century, that Paulina had been initiated into the Mysteries at Eleusis, at Lærna, and at Ægyna, that she had been purified in the blood-bath of the Taurobolia, and had devoted herself to Isis and to Hecate. Just as in the period of religious unrest which preceded the Reformation, we find men and women becoming members of many different religious associations to do reverence to various saints,—witness the sage Dr. Pfeffinger, the trusted councillor of the Elector Frederick, and the political adviser of the Emperor Maximilian, who was a member of no less than thirty-two,—so in those ages of religious ferment, when the young Christianity was slowly winning its way in the Roman world, men manifested their quest after a salvation of some kind by joining themselves to many varying cults.

This pagan Syncretism was on the one side a preparation for Christianity, and on the other a formidable opponent. It is therefore important to know what it was if we are to grasp clearly the historical settings of that wonderful time when our faith was young. Nor is such a knowledge merely the gratification of an intellectual curiosity. It has a practical side for Christianity at home and on the mission field—at home, for our modern theosophy is largely a revival, adapted to modern tastes, of that old pagan Syncretism; and abroad, for so many missionaries are at work among Oriental peoples where these early beliefs have still a dominant power.

This knowledge can only be had by learning what can be known about those cults whose ideas and cultus rites were most largely spread. A distinguished French scholar, M. Cumont, has recently given us a learned and exhaustive treatise on the widely spread Mithraism, which is perhaps the most important. Now Mr. Hepding has published his long expected study on the Attis cult,

which was also very widely spread. We still need, in spite of much writing on the subject, exhaustive monographs on the Isis and Serapis cults, and on others besides.

Mr. Hepding has done his work very thoroughly. He has collected and arranged in chronological order—and this order is very valuable and indeed indispensable when we consider the changes which time and the approximation to other cults produced—all the information which ancient literature from Herodotus to Gregory of Tours gives us upon the Attis cult. He has also collected the evidence from inscriptions. He has a careful chapter on the various names given to Attis. He traces the changes in the Attis myth, and describes the Attis cult. And he has a suggestive chapter on the relations of the cult to the Mysteries and to the Taurobolia. Altogether the book is a very helpful contribution to our knowledge of what underlay that pagan Syncretism which confronted Christianity from the first to perhaps the fifth century.

Glasgow.

T. M. LINDSAY.

The Unjust Steward.

BY THE REV. GEORGE MURRAY, B.D., SAUCHIE MANSE, ALLOA.

THERE is a fine boldness about the earthly story here. Pietistic weaklings fly morbidly from what they call the 'world,' and ritualism gets disastrously divorced from daily life; but robust religion rejoices to see every sphere of human interest interpenetrated by its power. Jesus not only does not flee the world, but turns it to account in a way at which some are astonished. He holds up as ensample the wisdom of a knave, albeit a wisdom we are to apply to better purpose, and in higher things. Those who marvel at this, forget that Jesus had the preacher's instinct of startling his hearers into wholesome thought on things divine. His deepest sayings run to paradox. He could have taken a more respectable figure from society: one showing the prudence and decision held up in the picture as a model for translation to the kingdom's high affairs. But the thing is far more rousing and far more piquant as it stands, and therefore far more potent in the practical realm of edification—which was the end and object of it all. The fact that

commentators through the long ages have puzzled over peculiar aspects of the case, is tribute to its power. And rest seems in sight for them at last, through the acute suggestion of a critic, that the moral about using riches to subserve eternal interests—surely a too calculating kind of piety—is in reality a secondary application, an adventitious lesson. It was some one's later thought to read 'everlasting habitations,' in the allegorizing spirit, as the somewhat mechanical interpretation of the phrase about the steward's reception by the debtors 'into their houses.' What our Lord commends in the parable is resolution and resource, qualities strikingly exhibited in mundane affairs. The grandest possible results before God would follow if these things were actively employed in the great kingdom. But, unfortunately, 'the children of this world are in their generation wiser than the children of light.'

'There was a certain rich man which had a steward.' The two figures move quickly on the stage: the one a wealthy owner, living apparently

at a distance from his possessions, and the other his man-of-business or local agent, a person gifted with energy and shrewdness, although unprincipled in the moral sphere. As factor he abused flagrantly the confidence of his master. Personal extravagance seems the key to his character: a free and genial man to those beneath him, and just as falsely kind to himself, all at the expense of his lord's revenue. 'The same was accused unto him that he had wasted his goods.' And evidently on being confronted with his employer, he stands convicted; for when the question comes, 'How is it that I hear this of thee?' he remains silent, and the silence is construed as acknowledgment of guilt. Forthwith the sentence of deprivation follows, 'Give an account of thy stewardship; for thou mayest be no longer steward.' Now he is menaced by misery, and the critical point in his career has come. Poverty, for the moment, seems the only prospect of the near future. With him recklessness had become a confirmed habit, and he has laid up nothing. 'What shall I do?' he asks desperately, on realizing that ruin has him in the wind; 'for my lord taketh away from me the stewardship: I cannot dig, to beg I am ashamed.' Though he could stoop to knavery, he could not unbend to be the honest day-labourer. His hands were morally, not physically, soiled. There is a touch of pathos in the literal force of his confession, 'I have not strength.' As to the other business-opening, how could one of his lordly carriage put on the mendicants' whine? Though he had been far from upright, enough of pride remained to keep him from going down to that—'to beg I am ashamed.' But if not a man of muscle, he was a man of brain; and in the dire dilemma his characteristic sagacity comes out. A clever scheme suggests itself, and as the bright idea strikes him, he exclaims, 'I have it—I am resolved what to do, that when I am put out of the stewardship, they may receive me into their houses.' Every trade tends to develop tricks, especially tricks which cannot be challenged at law, although sufficiently shady in themselves, and clearly impeachable at the heavenly bar of righteousness. The steward has been ordered, as the giving up of his stewardship, to prepare an inventory of accounts, and arrange in general for handing over affairs. Why not throw a sop to some, while yet his master's money is at his tender mercy? Their favour for the future should be propitiated. The vulgar form

of theft would have been to pick up odd coin and decamp. But our steward had a dainty touch. He is going in for a business which has 'good-will.' The safest bank for him, he perceives, will be some grateful friends. The doings of a steward, it must be remembered, are in their nature arbitrary, and in fixing values there was a margin on which his judgment could come and go. His conduct might be essentially theft, but within certain limits he was technically free of prosecution. Any great man's underling, dealing with people lower down than himself, may fix prices poorer than the market average, and there is nobody to say him, Nay. Our steward was an adept in this art. He summoned every one of his lord's debtors to count and reckon with him for the last time. Merchants they were, we can imagine, who got supplies of goods on credit, bills being allowed to stand against them till sales could be effected; or they were simply tenants who paid their rents in kind, the keeper of an olive-yard, for instance, paying the superior a percentage of oil in the year.

To the first debtor who approached, he said, 'How much owest thou unto my lord?' 'An hundred measures of oil.' 'Take thy bill,' said the steward, 'and sit down quickly, and write fifty.' In that 'quickly' we seem to see the promptness of the man; if not also a suspicion of nervous haste. There might be just a little tremble of the hand, as the voucher passed for alteration of the figures. In the same way a reduction was marked down on the bill of another, a dealer in grain. 'Write fourscore,' he said this time to the debtor of a hundred measures. The proportion varies. He knows his men, and knows their price: supplying perhaps another indication of the great acuteness of this hero.

But the knavery of even the cleverest knaves is apt to be discovered, and somehow the fame of the smartness of the steward got abroad. It came to his master's ears; affording a parting proof, as it were, of the ability which secured him the office at the first. Clearly, the tactics were unscrupulous, and yet they compelled admiration of a kind. The master was a man of the world himself, and he had enough of humour to note his servant's wit. This was not the earliest or strongest feeling he had upon the subject, but it was there. 'The lord (the landlord) commended the unjust steward, because he had done wisely.' It is only the skill

we admire in a forger or thief, but it was certainly skill. And skill, we saw, not so open to counter-attack, as that of the common forger and thief. There was something like genius in the cool daring of the steward, who thus declined to be caught. Though times were pressing, and opportunity was small, he tided his fortunes through a great crisis. He had been quick to see, smart to plan, prompt to carry out. Lay aside for the moment the high question of morals—the postulates of honesty and common honour—and remember you are dealing with a story of the world, coloured by the ways of the world, and you can appreciate at once this master's large-eyed commendation of the man. He was a long-headed fellow, who extricated himself very deftly from his difficulty—he was a man of resolution and resource.

Would that in religious matters, Christ means, these same qualities were as conspicuous. Would that the children of light rivalled in this respect the children of darkness. But, as a rule, it is not so. People do not put their mind and heart and purpose into things spiritual as much as into things temporal. They will chase a fox, or speed the search for fortune, with a zeal which they never show in pursuit of a lost soul, or the advocacy of a mission cause. Their earthly ideal being what it is, they are thorough in bringing all their acts into harmony therewith. Not so in the plane of religion. There is slackness, and that want of intelligent interest which aggravates slackness. In this, as in other matters, knowledge makes for appreciation, and the kindling of enthusiasm to the white heat. If the Church becomes more an agent of enlightenment, and deeper discernment of the Scriptures be diffused, great will be the gain. For a popular war, men give freely of their best in sacrifice; but for the far greater conflict with heathenism in society at home and abroad, there is nothing like the same willingness to spend and be spent. Be the reasons, however, what they may, the fact remains, that where the eternal and invisible and less obvious is concerned, we are far less marked by persevering earnestness, and wise devotion to passing opportunities, than in the fleeting things of time and sense. Look at the man of business, bent on amassing money, and gaining all that in earthly moods ambition craves. How his whole soul is in the matter. Week in, week out, he strives and strains; he rises early and works late. What

long toil, what short holiday. How he saves and saves, and schemes and plans, and plans again, and succeeds visibly to a wonderful extent. But compare with this men's action, or want of action, regarding the riches of the soul, the graces of the Christian heart, the state of spiritual being more to be desired than gold. How faint, comparatively speaking, are even conscious followers of Jesus in devotion to a nobler cause. Faith often is enfeebled, and hope is depressed, and love waxes selfish and cold. What failure in the time of crises; what want of steadfast resolution; what poverty of performance as against blatant profession. The keen, clear, commercial head knows always what it would be at. Such a man drives straight to the point. See how he flies low, because it is the shorter arc. The underlings of his office are familiar with the strident call, 'It must be done.' He acts, while the religious man dreams. The parallel of this business spirit we may well envy for the varied offices of the Church. Rousing would be its effect, not to say drastic the change. At terms of searching light and bracing breeze removals might be frequent, and fondly cherished articles cheap. We hear everywhere the cry for training—intellectual, physical, technical. All the sciences and all the arts must advance. And that is well. But what about the schooling of the passions, the education of the soul? Parliament is pledged to the advancement of the secular; but on the vital question of ethics it inclines to be content with the remark, 'We won't meddle with that.' The Lord's Day we acknowledge as our day of rest, but pray do not expect us to be as zealous for the things of heaven as we were on other matters through the week. Saturday afternoon we were so keen on sport, our money losses were forgotten. But Sunday morning, with its call to worship with our fellows—well, its rather showery, and somehow we have got a headache. The body is not allowed to suffer; nothing is too dainty for love or money to procure. But the soul—ah me, it may be on half rations for days and months together, or live like prodigals on husks, and famish in the far land. How true, how deep-cutting, the moral of this story, the commendation of the Master: 'The children of this world are *in their generation* wiser than the children of light.'

Learn a lesson from the astute steward. Show timely resolution in a better cause. He was wise but unfaithful; let us be wise and faithful.

Seizing every opportunity while it availeth, turn time, talents, every good gift from above, to the advancement of God's kingdom among men. Be the kindly, gracious brother to every one within your range. That is the Christian's way of changing the hundred to the fifty and the fourscore. How unbusinesslike to waste life. The best investment, the one that creates the atmosphere of goodwill all around, is in deeds of charity and mercy. Listen to the beauteous saying of the old prophet:

'Loose the bands of wickedness, undo the heavy burdens, let the oppressed go free, and break every yoke. Deal thy bread to the hungry, and bring the poor that are cast out to thy house; when thou seest the naked, cover him; and hide not thyself from thine own flesh. Then shall thy light break forth as the morning, and thine health shall spring forth speedily: and thy righteousness shall go before thee; the glory of the Lord shall be thy re-reward.'

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

ACTS x. 34-35.

'And Peter opened his mouth, and said, Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons: but in every nation he that feareth Him, and worketh righteousness, is acceptable to Him' (R.V.).

EXPOSITION.

'And Peter opened his mouth, and said.'—ἀνοίξας τὸ στόμα, used only to introduce some weighty utterance (cf. Mt 5² before the Sermon on the Mount, Ac 8³⁵, Job 3¹, Dn 10¹⁶).—PAGE.

'Of a truth I perceive.'—I perceive, καταλαμβάνομαι, to take hold of, to lay hold of so as to make one's own, to obtain complete possession of a spiritual truth gained by personal experience.—PELOUBET.

'That God is no respecter of persons.'—An inference from God's having heard the prayers of a Gentile, deemed him worthy of the light of the gospel, and sent an angel to direct him to it.—COOK.

'Respecter of persons.'—προσωπολήπτῃς. This phrase indicates paying regard to the external circumstances or accidental qualities of a man as opposed to his intrinsic character. To show special favour to a Jew, merely because he was a Jew, would be πρόσωπον λαμβάνειν.—PAGE.

THE same thing is repeatedly denied of God in Scripture (Dt 10¹⁷, 2 S 14¹⁴, 2 Ch 19⁷, 1 P 1¹⁷).—ALEXANDER.

'But in every nation he that feareth Him and worketh righteousness.'—Feareth Him is our duty towards God; worketh righteousness, our duty towards our neighbour.—COOK.

It is obvious that this doctrine deals with the mysterious operations of divine grace; in particular, with 'works before justification.' In the sixteenth century, led away by reaction against exaggerated merit attached to good works, with minds dominated by the idea of justification by faith, extreme reformers denied the possibility of any righteousness before justification. But it will be profitable to notice what is plainly revealed to us by this history of Cornelius. It is

clear that he was already working righteousness and acceptable to God before he had consciously 'believed in Christ.' But he was not therefore without the inspiration of the spirit of Christ. But though acceptable to God, his righteousness was still imperfect. For it did not spring from the highest motive, namely, conscious faith in Christ, of whose work of redemption he was ignorant.—RACKHAM.

'Is acceptable to Him.'—The Greek word (δεκτός) signifies not only *acceptabilis*, but *acceptus*.—PAGE.

THE SERMON.

The First European Christian.

By the Rev. R. F. Horton, M.A., D.D.

Our Lord says of Himself, 'I am not come but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel.' After the Ascension we find that the disciples had not grasped the fact that the time was now come for widening the Kingdom. They made the discovery in the story of the first Gentile Christian.

1. *The Praying Heathen.*—Cornelius probably was connected with the Gens Cornelia, one of the oldest of Roman families. He was also a soldier, and had been for some time stationed at Cæsarea. There, without doubt, he had been impressed with the superiority of the Jewish religion, and, being a sincere man, he prayed to the God of the Jews. One day Cornelius was keeping the stated hour of prayer, three o'clock in the afternoon. For he, being a man who prayed constantly, knew how fruitful were stated times of prayer. While he prayed the angel came to him and told him that his prayer was accepted, sending him to Joppa, to Peter, who would tell him everything he wished to know. This incident occurred not only for the

benefit of Cornelius, however; it was also for the benefit of Peter. In all probability Paul was at this very time in Cæsarea, and how easy it would have been for him to come to Cornelius; but no, God wished to educate Peter.

2. *The Praying Christian.*—At three o'clock, two days later, Peter was also praying, and had a vision, which effectually taught him that the difference between Jew and Gentile was done away with. Peter was not entirely unprepared for this revelation. He had abated his Jewish prejudice by staying with a tanner—a trade regarded by the Jews as unclean. His surroundings also were a preparation. He was on the roof of the house, and, as far as his eyes could reach, stretched the Mediterranean Sea. Looking on its broad expanse, his own petty notions were swept away, and a feeling of the vastness of the world crept over him.

3. *The Meeting of the Praying Heathen and the Praying Christian.*—When Peter and Cornelius met, to Peter came broader sympathies and a humbler faith, and to Cornelius the 'light which passeth understanding.'

Cornelius.

By Frederick A. Noble, D.D., LL.D.

Professor Ramsay, in his late researches, has come to the conclusion that Cornelius was a proselyte; not a proselyte of the 'sanctuary,' but a proselyte of the 'gate.' This supposition he bases on the fact that Cornelius is always spoken of as one who 'fears God.' His inference we cannot admit. Indeed, to do so would belittle the significance of Peter's vision and the end which was reached by allowing Cornelius to become a member of the Christian Church.

Indeed, the first fact which impresses us in reading this incident is that now all men, no matter what their wealth, education, and race may be, have free access to God. All such distinctions were done away with when the words, 'What God hath cleansed make not thou common,' were uttered. It was when Peter realized this grand truth that he spoke the words of our text.

Another fact which impresses us when we read this story is the infinite time and trouble God takes to bring about His purposes through the instrumentality of men. Cornelius had a vision, and sent men to Joppa, where they did not simply take their chance of finding Peter ready to accompany

them; Peter also was prepared beforehand. Then also, when Peter returned with the servants of Cornelius, he found him waiting, surrounded by all his friends. This is God's way still, and always will be. He fits truth for hearts, and hearts for truth.

The Analogy between Ancient and Modern Religion.

By the late Professor B. Jowett, Master of Balliol.

After reading the words of our text, we are naturally reminded of that other passage in the second chapter of Galatians, where Peter refused to eat meat with certain Gentiles, and was rebuked by Paul. Can we reconcile the two? There have been many attempts to do so. Some authorities say that Peter forgot his early vision; others that the Cephas mentioned in Galatians was not Peter; still others that the opposition between Peter and Paul was only 'the amicable fervour of two friends who agreed to differ.'

Though we cannot explain this seeming discrepancy, we know that our text, 'God is no respecter of persons,' is true. It embodies the spirit of the Old Testament prophets. It is repeated again and again in the New Testament. 'There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free,' but all are 'one in Christ Jesus.'

'In every nation he that feareth Him and worketh righteousness is acceptable to Him.' Let us look briefly at some of the outstanding men of other nations and other ages who, according to their own light, worked righteousness. They rise in review before us: Zoroaster, Buddha, Socrates, Plato, Epictetus, Seneca, Marcus Aurelius, and many others. In the belief and in the writings of all these men we find perceptions of the Divine Nature as true to us as to those who uttered them. There is a distinction made between good and evil. God is represented as loving the good and hating the evil. We find this idea beautifully expressed in the Vedic hymns: 'Whenever we may commit an offence before the heavenly host; whenever we break Thy law through thoughtlessness, have mercy, Almighty, have mercy.'

To Zoroaster was revealed the omnipotence of God: 'I believe Thee, O God, to be the best thing of all, the source of light for the world.' Still in the East; and a few centuries later we come to Buddha, the advocate of holy living. In many points how Christlike was his teaching. Speaking

about forgiveness, he says, 'If a man tear out one of your eyes, let him take the other also, and live by the light of inward intelligence.' He taught the necessity of truth; he also insisted on purity and the avoidance of sins of the flesh.

We next pass to the Greek and Roman philosophers. In a well-known passage, Plato, speaking of God, says, 'First, He is good; secondly, He is true. Whatever evil there is in the world is partly the consequence of the sins of men and the remedy for them, and, at anyrate, is not to be attributed to the will of the Divine Being.' Still more Christ-like are the words of Seneca: 'I am conscious that I am now converted; and the proof of a truly converted soul is to know those things to be wrong which were once esteemed right.'

Looking at these religions as a whole, we see that they have all partaken in a measure of the eternal element of truth and light. So when we come into contact with the followers of Zoroaster and Buddha, we can appeal to their common sentiment of religion; we can refer them to an authority which they recognize, and so prepare the way for the higher teaching; that on Christ Jesus.

And now, having acquired new truths by our survey of other religions, we return thankfully to our own, filled with the conviction of its superiority. It is simpler, purer, better than any other, combining the graces and beauties of them all, exhibiting in one divine image the features of truth so dimly seen in all the rest, and leading us to a truer knowledge of the Universal Father, in whose presence all nations of the earth live and move.

ILLUSTRATIONS.

UNHEARD by all but angel ears
The good Cornelius knelt alone;
Nor dream'd his prayers and tears
Would help a world undone.

The while upon his terrac'd roof
The lov'd apostle to his Lord,
In silent thought aloof
For heavenly vision soar'd.

The saint beside the ocean pray'd,
The soldier in his chosen bower,
Where all his eye survey'd
Seem'd sacred in that hour.

To each unknown his brother's prayer,
Yet brethren true in dearest love
Were they—and now they share
Fraternal joys above.—JOHN KEEBLE.

The Reception of New Truth.—With the change of scene in the Book of Acts there is corresponding change of personal attitude; conversions not only in character, but in opinion; it is a record not only of repenting and turning, but of broadening. Here we have the experience of Peter, matching and rounding that of Cornelius; for God is teaching them both, drawing them off into the realm of vision, where they can be more effectually moulded to the divine uses. Sleep is not vacant of spiritual impression. God giveth His beloved, not sleep, but '*in* sleep.' Into that mystery of physical repose that unbars the doors of the mind and withdraws the sentry of the will, the Spirit may come as unto its own, and say what it could not when the man is hedged about with wakeful and watchful powers.—T. T. MUNGER.

In every Nation.—Twelve years ago, at a great jubilee demonstration in the island of Samoa, an old man who had himself been a heathen priest before the missionaries came, made a curious statement, that in those heathen days, when he knew nothing at all about what we call revealed religion, and when he was practising the rites of heathenism, he was on one occasion intensely desirous that a sister whom he loved should be raised from a bed of sickness, and so intensely did he desire it that he not only asked the gods, but he made a propitiatory sacrifice. He cut off the third finger of his left hand, and offered it to the gods; and when that did not avail, he cut off the little finger of his hand and offered it to the gods; and then his sister recovered. God hears prayers, even of heathen.—R. F. HORTON.

In every Nation.—Hagar in the wilderness betook herself to prayer. It was not the God of Israel she communed with; it was her own God. But, says the narrative, He answered her—the prayer of an outcast from Israel is answered by the God of Egypt. But the grand thing—to Hagar and to ourselves—was the moral bearing of this fact. It made the voice of God say, in effect, 'Other sheep I have which are not of this fold.' It declared that God had a place for the pariah—a place for the lands outside the line of Abraham. It proclaimed that the God of Abraham and the God of Isaac was still the God of Egypt and the God of Hagar. It announced that, while He had blessed the seed of the patriarch, He had also a blessing for the nations outside.—GEORGE MATHESON.

Respect of Persons.—On one occasion Peter Cartwright, the Backwoods Methodist preacher, was occupying the pulpit of a time-serving fashionable preacher at Nashville. He was in the middle of his sermon when Andrew Jackson ('Old Hickory') entered the building and walked up the main aisle. The presence of so great a man—the President of the United States—overpowered the clergyman in charge, and bending over to Peter Cartwright he said in an audible whisper, 'General Jackson has come in; General Jackson has come in.' 'And who,' thundered out Cartwright, 'is General Jackson? If he doesn't get his soul converted, God will damn him as quick as He would a Guinea negro!' It may well be supposed that the congregation was startled, and the next day the Nashville pastor went, with abject apologies, to the general, regretting the indignity that had

been offered him. But the independence of the bold Backwoods apostle, so far from giving offence to 'Old Hickory,' won his lasting regard, and Cartwright was afterwards his honoured guest at the Hermitage.—J. F. B. TINLING.

FOR REFERENCE.

Foster (J.), Lectures, vol. ii. 170.

Horton (R. F.), Lyndhurst Road Pulpit, vol. i. 259.

Lewis (Z. H.), Petros, 255.

Momerie (A. W.), Church and Creed, 1.

Munger (T. T.), Freedom of Faith, 49.

Nicholson (M.), Redeeming the Time, 339.

Noble (F. A.), Typical N.T. Conversions, 211.

Stier (R.), Words of the Apostles, 154.

Thompson, (H.), Concionalia, Outlines of Sermons, 40.

Tinling (J. F. B.), Facts and Similes.

Watson (R. A.), In the Apostolic Age, 289.

The Jewish Prayer-Book.

A STUDY IN THE WORSHIP OF THE SYNAGOGUE.

BY THE REV. G. H. BOX, M.A., HEBREW MASTER AT MERCHANT TAYLORS' SCHOOL, LONDON.

I. Introductory.

IF a typical cultivated Christian were asked to state what, in his opinion, is the radical defect of orthodox Judaism, he could, I suppose, give but one answer. He would say that it lies in the exaggerated place that is given, in the Jewish religious system, to the principle of Law. Judaism is dominated by the legalistic spirit, which has invested it with a certain artificiality and rigidity, a harsh and forbidding externality, manifesting itself in frigid ceremonialism and a marked lack of religious warmth. Does not the typical exponent of orthodox Judaism find his highest religious exercise and his deepest spiritual satisfaction in the pedantic logic of Rabbinical jurisprudence and the dreary casuistry of the Talmud?

To a certain extent this indictment is true—but it by no means expresses the whole truth. It is true that Judaism, as it organized itself after the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 A.D., hopelessly committed itself to the principle of Law, which finds its logical outcome and expression in the Talmudic Codes. Yet Judaism has never been deficient in some of the higher and deeper elements that form an essential part of all true religion. Beneath and behind all this forbidding exterior a genuine religious spirit has never ceased to pulsate. One eminent English scholar, who, in a remarkable article published some nineteen years ago, did not hesitate to criticise later Judaism, even describes this element in later Jewish religion as in a certain sense Christian. 'I admit,' he says, 'that both in Jewish literature and in Jewish life there is a Christianity, or (for I am not using this word in

a dogmatic sense) a Christianness, of a more developed character than that which St. Augustine recognizes in every human soul.'¹ In spite of its legalism, its inadequate view of sin and its doctrine of merits, it is impossible not to recognize the spiritual power and lofty devotion that the religion of the synagogue has often manifested, and still often manifests, in its adherents.

The following tribute to the character of that typical product of the Rabbinical system, the *Lamdan*, or learned Jew, as he is seen in Russia and Poland is, I think, convincing. It is from the pen of the venerable Professor Chwolson of St. Petersburg, who was born and educated in a circle where the strictest Rabbinical ideas prevailed, and who is, moreover, a Christian.

Speaking of the *Lamdanim*, as he recollects them, he says: 'Other than Rabbinical learning did not then exist among the Russian-Polish Jews. The *Lamdan* was, in his own department, a cultivated person; he was, however,—and this is the main point,—as a rule, a thoroughly moral and ethically developed man. He was serious, religious, genuinely pious; never spoke any evil of any man, by way of slander or malice; did not "sit in the seat of scorners" and so shunned the card-table and dissipation; and was full of piety and consideration towards others: never used an unseemly expression or anything equivocal—any profanity, any "soiling of the lips"; attached much importance to decorum and courteous behaviour, and that too not merely in society outside the home, but also in his own quiet sanctum; he also treated

¹ Professor T. K. Cheyne, 'The Jews and the Gospel' (*Expositor*, 3rd series, vol. i., 1885, pp. 401 ff.).

his children with gentleness, and his wife with tender consideration and loving regard, and was pure and honourable in all his actions. Such was my own revered father, and such were all my male relatives whom I knew, and who were all Lamedanim.¹

The truth is, nothing is easier for those who look at Judaism from the outside, and before whose eyes the externals of the Talmudic system bulk so large, than to underestimate the religious vitality that lies behind. Jewish literature, too, is of so varied a character and covers such an enormous range that it is exceedingly difficult for the uninitiated to appreciate its true religious value.

No doubt this very fact has proved a constant source of danger to Judaism itself. Even the Jew has sometimes felt the difficulty of seeing the forest for the trees. But, indeed, all Jews are not Talmudists. It is in its Liturgy, however, its Prayer-Book—where Jewish popular religion is really reflected and expressed—that we find the true measure of Judaism's devotional power. And to the study of this—which is comparatively an easy task with the aids that exist—the attention of those who realize the importance of forming some adequate and living conception of what Judaism really is, may be invited.

Here, if anywhere, the 'Christian' element in Jewish religion, which, according to Professor Cheyne, prophesies 'of a Jewish Christianity' to come, is to be seen. How large this element is has been admirably and yet succinctly set forth by the Rev. C. J. Ball, in a paper from which I will venture to quote: 'A very cursory examination of the Jewish Prayer-Book,' he says, 'reveals the fact that the Jewish coincides with the Catholic religion in many capital characteristics. Its prayers express most of the essential needs of humanity in terms as striking and beautiful as any supplied by our own Liturgies. The vivid sense of entire dependence upon God for Life and Light, for healing and happiness; the longing for emancipation from the bondage of the external and for the attainment of spiritual purity; the profound consciousness that man is sanctified by the Divine Law, which is the very principle of his perfection; the joy in God as the King of the universe and in the glory of His Kingdom; the strong assurance of His Personality, as a Being at once righteous

and merciful, tender, and true; the belief that He is the Eternal Source of all being besides His own, that He is One and that there is no unity like His; that He is incorporeal and immaterial; that He is the First and the Last; that He knows all our thoughts and deeds, and recompenses the obedient and the sinner; the sublime conviction that all the words of Prophecy are true; the daily expectation of the Coming of the Messiah; the momentous doctrine that the dead will live again; all these and many other features of Judaism bear a close resemblance to the faith of Christendom, and should have their influence in a mutual attraction and an enlightened sympathy between the Churches of which they are the common possession. Israel prays as we pray, Our Father which art in Heaven; Israel prays with us that He may hallow His name throughout the world; Israel prays as we pray, Lead us not into the power of sin and temptation; and so for the other suffrages of the Divine Petition. Ours alone, of all the many religions of man, shares with the Jew the persistent hope of the final restoration of Israel; we alone pray with the Jew that God will gather His ancient people from the four corners of the earth.'² Such is the general character of the Jewish Prayer-Book, as it strikes an accomplished Christian scholar. Before coming, however, to a closer consideration of the prayers, it is necessary to make one or two more general remarks.

Leaving out of account the radical alterations that have been introduced in the Reform synagogues, we shall confine our attention to the liturgical formularies of orthodox Judaism; and in this category we shall include the formularies not merely of the most strictly orthodox, but also those of the moderate party, whose modifications of the older ritual do not involve any essential break with tradition, but are mainly in the direction of the omission of redundant matter. But within the ranks of the orthodox Jews there is an important division, which depends not upon recently developed differences of opinion and taste, but upon the effects produced by living in communities widely separated and influenced by widely different historical conditions during many centuries of the past. According to this division, the Jews fall into two main classes, namely, those of the *Sefardim* and the *Ashkenazim*. Now, by the mediæval Jews, the land Sepharad mentioned in Obadiah 20 was

¹ *Das letzte Passamahl Christi*, etc., p. 74n.

² *Church and Synagogue*, vol. iii. p. 50f.

identified with Spain, while Ashkenaz, one of the descendants of Japheth (Gn 10³), was identified with Germany, probably because of the similarity in sound of the name Gomer (the father of Ashkenaz) with that of the Teutonic Fatherland.¹ Hence Ashkenaz is the mediæval Jewish name for Germany, and Sephard of Spain; and the Jews of German- and Slavonic-speaking countries are called *Ashkenazim*, while the Spanish and Portuguese Jews are named *Sephardim*. The Ashkenazim or German-speaking Jews have for centuries used among themselves a German jargon, the commonest form of Yiddish, which is derived from the dialect of the Rhine; and this form of speech prevails even among those who live in Slavonic-speaking countries. The reason is that the Jews of Bohemia, Hungary, and Poland (as well as of Germany proper) are the descendants of those who were originally settled in the Rhine valley, having overflowed into these countries from the original settlement, and having carried their German speech with them. The original colony is said to have consisted of Galileans who were deported to the lower Rhine in the reign of the emperor Hadrian. On the other hand, the Jews of Spain and Portugal have overflowed into Provence, Italy, North Africa, and Turkey. Their diffusion was especially stimulated by the expulsion from Spain in 1492, which was also responsible for the founding of a Sephardic settlement in Holland, and from thence later in London. Now the Ashkenazim and Sephardim differ on the following points: (1) in their pronunciation of Hebrew; the former reproducing, to a large extent, the provincial peculiarities of Galilee, the latter approximating more nearly to the classical diction of Judæa; (2) in the intonation of the prayers and Bible lessons: 'the Sefardim have pretty much maintained the old Oriental chants, which move in a very narrow compass, while the Germans and Poles have allowed a strong European element to enter their religious music';² and (3) there are differences, on the whole, by no means inconsiderable, between the service-books of the two divisions. The importance of these, however, must not be exaggerated. In the oldest elements of the Liturgy they are in essential agreement—the Sefardic versions being distinguished by a marked tendency to diffuseness and Oriental exuberance of expression (e.g. the heaping up of

synonyms). It is in later additions to the Liturgy that the two branches most markedly differ. The German Prayer-Book seems ultimately to have been derived from Tiberias, in Galilee; that of the Sefardim from the Babylonian Schools (in the ninth century A.D.). The technical term for these varieties of liturgical form and usage is *minhag* (= custom). Thus 'the German minhag' and 'the Portuguese minhag' are spoken of. The former is divided into two varieties, namely, the Ashkenazic minhag proper (that of Western Germany) and the Polish minhag (that of Eastern Germany and of the countries farther east and south-east).³ Modern movements of population have in many cases brought Jews of these originally separate communities into close proximity. But in these cases the old distinctions are still maintained, and so we find German synagogues in Jerusalem, and Portuguese synagogues in London, Paris, Hamburg, and Vienna, side by side with the synagogues that follow the minhag of the original settlements of the places in question. It ought here to be mentioned that the Jews of the East (Egypt, Palestine, and Arabia) had originally a minhag different from those of the Ashkenazim and Sefardim; but after Maimonides' stay in Egypt, and also owing to the influx of refugees from Spain after the expulsion, the Sefardic Liturgy displaced the earlier ritual in these countries.

Among the Jews of one district of Arabia, however,—namely, Yemen,—many of the peculiar features of the earlier and original usage still survive, which are of great historical interest and value. Of even greater importance from the historical point of view are the Liturgy of the Karaites—a Jewish sect in the Crimea, who repudiate rabbinical traditions—and that of the little community of Samaritans which still survives at Nablûs, the ancient Shechem, in Palestine. There is also a mystical Jewish sect, numbering some five hundred thousand, scattered about districts of Poland, Russia, Northern Hungary, and Roumania, known as the *Chasîdim*, or 'Pious,' who have a Prayer-Book of their own. This, however, is mainly based on the Sefardic minhag. This sect, while not denying the binding force of rabbinical ordinances, attaches a higher value to

¹ See *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, i. 193 (s.v. 'Ashkenaz').

² Dembitz, *Jewish Services in Synagogue and Home*, p. 15.

³ The term 'minhag' is also used in a wider sense to denote any variety of local usage or custom in civil life. The Mishnic rule is: *Everything according to the custom (minhag) of the country* (הכל כמנהג המדינה, *Baba Metzia*, ix. 1).

the esoteric teachings of the Kabbala than to the Talmud.

In what follows we shall take for our text-book, as being most practically useful for our purpose, the German minhag, as it is used among the

Ashkenazic congregations of Great Britain and the British Empire, in Singer's convenient edition.¹

¹ *The Authorized Daily Prayer-Book* (Hebrew and English), published by Eyre & Spottiswoode.

(To be continued.)

At the Literary Table.

Notes and Notices.

MR. ALLENSON'S 'Handy Theological Library' is excellent evidence that there are theological as well as other masterpieces which may be bound in leather and sold at a small price. Phillips Brooks' *Lectures on Preaching* is one of the volumes. It costs 3s. net.

Messrs. A. & C. Black have published a sixpenny edition of Professor Percy Gardner's *A Historic View of the New Testament*. It is very well printed.

The story of the C.M.S. and C.E.Z.M.S. missions in the Punjab and Sindh was told by the late Rev. Robert Clark, and now it has been made into a book by Mr. Robert Maconachie, late of the Indian Civil Service, and published by the Church Missionary Society at 3s. 6d. net. It is a big book for the money, and there is plenty in it—plenty of information, plenty of enthusiasm.

St. Mary's! What a fascination is in the name in Oxford! And its sound has gone forth far beyond Oxford. Who does not know that 'here John Keble delivered the testimony which marked the beginning of the Oxford movement'? Who does not know that 'here Newman's afternoon sermons were preached'? The present vicar, the Rev. H. L. Thompson, is proud of his church and its history. He has preached the facts of that history in seven sermons, and had the sermons published by Messrs. Constable in a book which bears a most exquisite photograph of St. Mary's as a frontispiece. Order the book by the title of *The Church of St. Mary the Virgin* (3s. 6d. net).

The new volume of the Century Bible is *Judges and Ruth* (Jack; 2s. 6d. net). The author is

Professor Thatcher of Mansfield College, Oxford. The Authorized Version is dropped: it was a useless swelling of the bulk of the book. Judges does not need a new commentary so cryingly as some other books of the Old Testament; for we have Moore and Black, a big and a little, both excellent. Still Mr. Thatcher is thoroughly furnished, and he can see things for himself.

Messrs. Longmans have published a remarkably cheap (3s. 6d. net) edition of the late Bishop of Oxford's *Ordination Addresses*.

The Principal of the Church of Scotland Training College in Glasgow is a literary enthusiast. He should have been chosen for some Chair of English Literature ere now. For he has insight as a student, enthusiasm and experience as a teacher. Mr. Williams' new book is entitled *Our Early Female Novelists* (Maclehose; 2s. 6d. net); but it contains essays also on Pope, Emily Brontë, Scott's Poetry, and Zola's *Theory of the Novel*.

'The King's Classics' are small quarto volumes after the antique manner—broad margin and white label and the binding cords prominent across the back. Roper's *Life of Sir Thomas More* is the volume in our hands (Moring; 1s. 6d. net). It is well edited with notes, index, and careful reprint of Singer's modernized text. After the Life come the letters to his daughter. The romance of Sir Thomas More's life has been written once for all by Miss Manning in *The Household of Sir Thomas More*. This is the reality for which Miss Manning's readers have often asked.

Of the lives that were lost in the Boxer riots, it would seem that not the least valuable was the life of a young American missionary, Horace Tracy Pitkin. Lost, did we say? Short it was

certainly, but already Horace Pitkin had packed as much unselfish giving into it as most men accomplish in threescore years and ten. His *Memorial*, written by Robert E. Speer (Revell; 3s. 6d. net), will now carry the influence of his life into more lands than he himself could ever have seen.

The Religious Tract Society has published a new edition of the *Pilgrim's Progress* with coloured illustrations—in the belief that for price (1s.) and attractiveness (blue and gold binding, blue and brown colour-printing) it can surpass all the editions that have gone before it.

We all know that to see the world we do not need to stir from the fireside. We only need to have Mrs. O. W. Scott beside us telling her tales. *Twelve Little Pilgrims who stayed at Home* (Revell; 3s. 6d. net) were through Japan and China and India and saw everything that is worth seeing. And twelve hundred little pilgrims may go the same journey in a similar comfortable arm-chair.

Canon Benham has written a Preface to *The True Ground of Faith*, a volume of five sermons, which the Rev. R. S. Mylne preached in the Cathedral Church of Bangor (Stocks; 1s. net). No doubt sermons are apt to slip through, there are so many. But this volume is worth reading, and would have made its own way. Mr. Mylne has reverence for the Word of God and also spiritual discernment, as Canon Benham says, and he is sensible of the necessity that lies upon every man to preach to his own day.

The S.P.C.K. has published a new edition of Dr. Pinches' latest book, *The Old Testament in the Light of the Historical Records and Legends of Assyria and Babylonia* (8vo, pp. 598; 7s. 6d.). It entirely supersedes the first edition. For besides minor alterations all through, it contains an Appendix of a hundred new pages. This was inevitable, because the great find of our day, Hammurabi's Code, had to be dealt with; some notice had also to be taken of the *Babel-Bibel* controversy. And, in any case, books of this kind must either come out in new editions at frequent intervals or else drop out of existence, for there is always something turning up at Babylon, Susa, Niffer, Nineveh, and the other places where ex-

cavation is going on. Dr. Pinches gives a new translation of Hammurabi's Code, not quite so literal as that of Mr. Johns, and therefore somewhat more readable. Occasionally he adds the literal rendering in a footnote. In the footnotes there is also an occasional word of comment. Thus: Law 250. 'If a mad bull in its onset has gored a man and caused (him) to die, that case has no claim.' The comment is: 'As the dog his first bite, so the bull was allowed his first toss free.'

Under the title of *A Faithful Minister* the life of the Rev. Walter Senior, M.A., Vicar of Holy Trinity, Margate, has been rescued from oblivion. There are also some good sermons in the book. But the man himself is the best of it, and Mr. Senior, junior, has done more than a filial act, he has done a true Christian service in making his father known to us (Stock; 2s. 6d. net).

Messrs. Watts have issued the late Sir Leslie Stephens' *Agnostic's Apology* and other essays in their sixpenny 'Reasonable Religion' Series.

Nearer to God is a manual of devotions for the young, compiled by the Rev. Evan Daniel (Wells Gardner; 6d.).

PRACTICAL MORALS. By John K. Ingram, LL.D. (*A. & C. Black*. 8vo, pp. xii, 167. 3s. 6d. net).—Just before he died Comte drew up the plan of a treatise on Positive Morals which he hoped to write. It was to consist of two volumes, one dealing with Theoretic Morals, the other with Practical Morals. His successor as Director of Positivism, Pierre Laffitte, attempted to write both books after the master died. Dr. Ingram is indebted to Laffitte's effort, but he is dissatisfied with it. So he writes one of the books himself. It is the whole duty of man, as the writings of Comte and the thoughts of a most loyal disciple of Comte conceive it. How passionately it relates everything to humanity, how pathetically it pleads with humanity to be good for its own sake! The capitals scattered over the page arrest the eye. Is God in it after all? No, it is She and Her, not He or Him. It is humanity holding herself up as her own God. 'We then,' says Dr. Ingram, 'have presented to us in systematic form the conception

of humanity, not viewed merely as an aggregate of individuals, but as a great Being, developed in the progress of the ages, which, understanding better and better Her dwelling-place and Her own nature, increasingly takes the command of the world, and orders it for the benefit of the nations and families which constitute Her composite and perennial existence.'

ALCUIN: HIS LIFE AND HIS WORK. By C. J. B. Gaskoin, M.A. (Cambridge: *At the University Press*. Crown 8vo, pp. xxii, 275. 3s. 6d. net).—The Hulsean prize essay is not always published, is it? It is perhaps not always worth publishing. Some prize-takers take their prizes too easily—and take it too easy afterwards. Mr. Gaskoin studied Alcuin and all round him before he wrote his essay. After he took the prize with it, he went on studying and preparing his essay for the press. He consulted all the learned men within his reach—Dr. Swete, Dr. Mason, Mr. Burkitt, Mr. Frere, and many more; and then he published a book which he will never be ashamed of, though he should live to be a great Church historian.

WITNESSES FOR THE LIGHT. By Washington Gladden (*Clarke*. Crown 8vo, pp. 285. 4s. net).—These are the 'William Belden Noble Lectures' for 1903. Now William Belden Noble's supreme desire was to make known the meaning of the words of Jesus, 'I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it abundantly.' The first lecturer was Phillips Brooks, who lectured on 'The Influence of Jesus.' The latest lecturer is Washington Gladden, who lectures on some men whom Jesus influenced. Dante, Michelangelo, Fichte, Victor Hugo, Richard Wagner, Ruskin,—these are the men. It is biography with a purpose; written, as the Gospels were written, to prove something. It is written to prove that the abundant life which these men enjoyed, whether intellectual, moral, or spiritual, whether as poet, artist, philosopher, man of letters, musician, or preacher, was the gift of Christ. I am come that they—Dante and Ruskin and the rest—might have life abundantly.

STUDIES IN SHAKESPEARE. By J. Churton Collins (*Constable*. Crown 8vo, pp. xv, 380. 7s. 6d.).—The topics which Mr. Churton

Collins has 'studied' are Shakespeare as a Classical Scholar, Shakespearean Paradoxes, Sophocles and Shakespeare as Theological and Ethical Teachers, Shakespeare as a Prose-Writer, Was Shakespeare a Lawyer? Shakespeare and Holinshed, Shakespeare and Montaigne, The Text and Prosody of Shakespeare, The Bacon-Shakespeare Mania. The last study is the most entertaining. After this—and yet the Baconian craze outdoes the hydra-headed monster. 'Shakespeare as a classical scholar' is a revelation of Mr. Collins' learning—minute as a mediæval grammarian's, yet ranging over every fragment of Greece or Rome or Shakespeare. But the study that has pleased us most is the comparison between Sophocles and Shakespeare. Read this for example: 'I would venture to say, that if a thoughtful man, after going attentively through the thirty-seven plays, were asked what the prevailing impression made on him was, he would reply: "the awful reverence which Shakespeare shows for Religion—for the mysterious relation which exists between Man and God." The sense of the utter contemptibleness and unintelligibleness of man and life without reference to the Divine is not stronger or more pervading in Pindar, Aeschylus, and Sophocles.'

LAY WORK AND THE OFFICE OF READER. By Huyshe Yeatman-Biggs, D.D. (*Longmans*. Crown, 8vo, pp. 152. 2s. 6d.).—The Convocation of York had a long discussion on this very subject this very month. It is in the air. It is to be an accomplishment. There is to be an order of Readers, not clerics but laymen, with just a badge to distinguish them, and they are going to give the clergy much relief in town and country. The need and the supply—the whole case indeed—is fully declared in the Bishop of Southwark's little book. It is one of Mr. Robinson's series of 'Handbooks for the Clergy.'

REMINDERS OF OLD TRUTHS. By Hannah E. Pipe (*Longmans*. Crown 8vo, pp. 210. 3s. 6d. net).—A woman in the pulpit! The texts are here and the sermons. Well, in the pulpit or out of it, those sermons no man would be ashamed of. No preacher with a great reputation to retain would be ashamed of them. They are well worth every preacher's regard. The thought is sometimes delightfully fresh, it always rings well and is well expressed.

THE HOLY COMMUNION. By Darwell Stone, M.A. (*Longmans*. Crown 8vo, pp. x, 315. 5s.).—Mr. Stone and Canon Newbolt are the editors of the 'Oxford Library of Practical Theology.' In taking the volume on the Lord's Supper to himself, Mr. Stone did a meritorious thing. At least we cannot think of anyone to whom he could have assigned it with better results. What was wanted, and what we look for, was the High Church position stated temperately. Mr. Stone has done that. He is a member (we think) of the English Church Union, and although he would not go all the way with Lord Halifax and accept undiluted Transubstantiation, he does accept the 'declaration' of the English Church Union of 1900, 'that in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper the bread and wine, through the operation of the Holy Ghost, become, in and by consecration, according to our Lord's institution, verily and indeed the body and blood of Christ, and that Christ our Lord, present in the same Most Holy Sacrament of the altar under the form of bread and wine, is to be worshipped and adored.' Of this view of the Eucharist, Mr. Stone's volume is a most scholarly and a most persuasive defence.

CHRISTINA ROSSETTI'S POEMS. Edited by W. M. Rossetti (*Macmillan*. 7s. 6d.).—Now at last a complete edition of Christina Rossetti, and in every way acceptable and admirable. The memoir is very reticent, but that is right. The only subject on which there is perfect frankness is religion. W. M. Rossetti does not quite understand his sister's religion, he does not understand why anybody should be so religious. 'She did not face religion,' he says, 'with that courageous yet modest front with which a virtuous woman, who knows something of the world, faces life.' He is astonished, if not shocked, at 'her perpetual churchgoing and communions, her prayers and fasts, her submission to clerical direction, her oblations, her practice of confession'; and with much simplicity he says, 'I have often thought that Christina's proper place was in the Roman Catholic Church.'

But about the poetry. What is your favourite? Is it this?—

Grant us such grace that we may work Thy Will,
And speak Thy words and walk before Thy Face,
Profound and calm, like waters deep and still:
Grant us such grace.

Not hastening and not loitering in our pace
For gloomiest valley or for sultriest hill,
Content and fearless on our downward race.

As rivers seek a sea they cannot fill
But are themselves filled full in its embrace,
Absorbed, at rest, each river and each rill:
Grant us such grace.

THE OTHER ROOM. By Lyman Abbott (*Melrose*. 8vo, pp. 120. 3s. 6d. net).—Few words are needed on the life to come; the fewer the better if they are well chosen. Dr. Lyman Abbott has not much to say, but he says it well. His central thought is that the whole wide universe is the Father's House. He dwells in this room of it as well as in its other rooms. To step out of this room is not to lose our identity or even our home. It is to step into another room and be at home at once again. For home is where the loved ones are. And the Loved One, the most Loved One of all, is in the room we enter not less than in the room we leave. The book was worth Mr. Melrose's best bookish manner—worth a sea of beautiful white paper round an islet of print, worth two artistic shades of brown in the binding.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH. By R. F. Weidner, D.D., LL.D. (*Revell*).—Another of Dr. Weidner's clever résumés. This time it is Luthardt and Krauth that he condenses. He is clearer in his brevity than they ever were in their length. His questions and bibliography are his own, and most useful.

TO-DAY IN SYRIA AND PALESTINE. By William Eleroy Curtis (*Revell*. 8vo, pp. 529. 7s. 6d. net).—During the Boer War the discovery was made by newspaper correspondents that the more their correspondence was worthy the name of literature the more it was appreciated. Such newspaper correspondence could be published in a book. Such is this book. Mr. Curtis is not a war correspondent, but he is a newspaper correspondent. As he travelled through Syria and Palestine he sent an account of what he saw and experienced to the *Chicago Record-Herald*, and then, when he got home, he republished it all in this book. Its strength lies in the living impression. He wrote down what he saw there and then. There is movement and colour; there are conversations; all is vivid and real. Would the book have lost any of

this newspaper reality if Mr. Curtis had been a better scholar or been better furnished with other books? We cannot tell; let us be thankful for what we have. The illustrations are from exceptionally good photographs.

THE STORY OF THE NAZARENE. By Noah K. Davis, Ph.D. (*Revell*. 8vo, pp. 428. 6s. net).—‘Forasmuch,’ says Luke, ‘as many have taken in hand’—but Luke had no idea that the number of those who had taken in hand to write the Life of Christ before him was so insignificant compared with the number of those who should follow after him. There are Lives of Christ for everybody now. They range between Holtzmann and Davis. Dr. Davis is professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Virginia. His *Elements of Psychology* and other books are well known. He is a layman. And so the latest Life of Christ is all that a learned laymen can verify in his own experience of the gospel narratives. There seems to be very little in the Gospels that a layman cannot verify. Miracles? Surely, even inevitably, after the one great miracle, Jesus Christ Himself. But the very details of the gospel narrative are credible and suggestive to Professor Davis. The devil picked up a stone ‘of the size and shape of a loaf’ when he said tauntingly, ‘Command this stone that it become bread.’ The unclean spirits ‘sought to enlarge the limit of their power by stealing and using the brain and brawn of human victims.’ Martha of Bethany ‘is an ordinary housewife’; the woman of Samaria is ‘a common gossip.’ The book is likely to win a considerable popularity. Dr. Davis has neither the picturesque of Farrar nor the learning of Edersheim, but he is a wholesome combination of these two stalwarts.

SERMONS BY THE MONDAY CLUB. (*Robinson*. 8vo, pp. 380. 3s. 6d. net).—The sermons are on the International Lessons for 1904. Superintendents and others have to give a ten minutes’ address on the Lesson, and how are they to preach who never enter a pulpit? They are to read these sermons—all by able men—or get them up by heart if they like. It is an old institution, this Monday Club of Boston. This is the twenty-ninth series of these sermons. All the best men take a share of the work—Francis Clark, David Gregg, and W. E. Griffis being among them.

A SHORT CUT TO HAPPINESS. By the Author of ‘The Catholic Church from Within’ (*Sands*. Crown 8vo, pp. 108. 2s. 6d. net).—What is it? It is Renunciation. Now happiness may not be the end of existence, but it is the thing most beings pursue. So a short cut to it may preserve us for something higher. The short cut itself is that higher thing. ‘Not my will but thine’—it is the highest good as well as the greatest happiness.

MODERN SPIRITISM. By J. Godfrey Raupert (*Sands*. Crown 8vo, pp. 248. 5s.).—A moderately-sized, temperately-stated, competently-conceived account of the modern attempts to get in touch with the departed is much needed. Mr. Raupert has supplied it. He has no belief in spiritism, let it call itself by whatever name it chooses, but he does not seem to have disbelieved first and investigated afterwards. He clearly tells us what the admitted facts are; he clearly tells us what the surmises and imaginings are. The hey-day of spiritism’s popularity is probably past. But it will yet gain converts if we do not make that impossible. Unless we are already bitten, this book should prevent the delusion. One commendable thing about Mr. Raupert is his sympathy with the heart hunger that cries—

O for the touch of a vanished hand,
And the sound of a voice that is still.

If spiritism had shown that it could satisfy that hunger, if it had not shown that it mocks it and prevents the heart from seeking the true satisfaction, he would not have written his book.

BROWNING FOR BEGINNERS. By the Rev. Thomas Rain, M.A. (*Sonnenschein*).—It is just at the beginning that we need a guide to Browning. After a step or two we walk alone. Mr. Rain is scarcely so elementary as he thinks, but he is very enthusiastic. He has ideas, too, which Browning never gave him, as this terribly heretical one that religion is only for the few! Here are his amazing words: ‘They are only the few who have a natural genius for religion; *i.e.* for feeling the Unseen, and vitally relating themselves to it. To the great majority of men the Unseen is simply a hearsay; they do not deny it, but it is not to them a real thing, brooding over them—

‘A master o’er a slave,
A Presence which is not to be put by.

'I doubt if there is any means at the command of man by which they can be helped. The mystic, or religious man, is like the poet, born, not made. St. Paul knew this, or something in him knew it, when he said, "By the grace of God I am what I am." And how profound are the words of our Lord: "Blessed art thou, Simon Barjonah; for flesh and blood—*i.e.* philosophy, logic—hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven." The higher wisdom can be communicated only to the elect, to them who have a predilection for it, in whom its germ already is.

'Nay, be assured; no secret can be told
To any who divined it not before;
None uninitiate by many a presage
Will comprehend the language of the message,
Altho' proclaimed aloud for evermore.'

THEOLOGY IN GREEK PHILOSOPHY.

THE EVOLUTION OF THEOLOGY IN THE GREEK PHILOSOPHERS. By Edward Caird, LL.D., D.C.L., D.Litt. (*Maclehose*. 2 vols. 8vo. 14s. net.)

Those two attractive volumes, upon which the publisher is to be congratulated, contain the Gifford Lectures delivered in Glasgow in the sessions 1900-01 and 1901-02. Or rather they do not contain those lectures. For books and lectures are two different things, and the Master of Balliol, with a wise sense of the difference, has rewritten the lectures and made a book of them.

The subject is the Evolution of Theology in the Greek Philosophers. When the terms of Lord Gifford's will were published a great orthodox cry was heard in Scotland. Lectures were to be delivered every year in all the universities, and well paid for, in support of natural religion. It was questioned if there was any such thing as natural religion. In any case it was feared that the advocacy of natural religion would be to the prejudice of revelation. That cry is no longer heard. All those fears have departed. Lord Gifford's will came in the fulness of time. Our minds were ready to receive a larger conception of revelation. A larger conception of revelation has given us a larger conception of God. We are not less interested to-day in the theology of the Hebrew prophets, but we are more interested, we are getting quite keenly interested in the theology of the Greek philosophers.

Dr. Caird's book is good reading. The style is clear, the touch is sure. Even as a book-maker the Master of Balliol is something of an artist. The interest grows steadily. The first chapter gently awakens our literary and religious susceptibilities. The last chapter finds us absorbed in the matters of greatest moment in heaven above or earth beneath.

The hero of the last chapter is Plotinus. How admirable is the character of Plotinus as Dr. Caird sympathetically describes him. Not far, you say, not far from the kingdom of God. And yet, even in the hands of the Master of Balliol, even under the will of Lord Gifford, Plotinus is so described and Christianity is so described that he that is least in the kingdom of God is seen to be greater than he. Are we afraid to study other religions; are we afraid even to use religion in the plural? Our fears may deprive us of the greatest apology for Christianity, of the most sweeping victory for Christianity, that has been offered to any generation.

CHRISTIANITY AMONG THE RABBIS.

CHRISTIANITY IN TALMUD AND MIDRASH. By R. Travers Herford, B.A. (*Williams & Norgate*. 8vo, pp. xvi, 449. 18s. net.)

The life of the Apostle Paul was made bitter by the persecution of the Jews; but those who smote him most deeply were Jewish Christians. 'Perils from mine own countrymen'—these were serious enough; but it was the scorpion of the Judaizers that stung. What became of these Jews who would be Christians and yet would remain Jews? The history of Christianity drops them out. We think of them as having passed away with that first generation. We have not observed that they remained for several generations followers of the Lamb but followers of Moses also; unable to deny the Messiahship of Jesus, yet still making their boast in the Law; and that their history is to be read in the Talmud.

There never was an obscurer history written. It was of the genius of Rabbinism to be unintelligible. But the history of the Christian Jews is Rabbinism doubly dark. For the hatred and contempt which the Rabbis felt for those Jews in their midst who would be Christians and yet would remain Jews could be expressed only in the wildest torture of Scripture language. Mr. Herford has striven to rewrite that history. He begins with the refer-

ences to our Lord Himself. But the bulk and the strength of his book is given to the notices in Talmud and Midrash of the Minim, or heretics, in his judgment almost a technical name for the Jewish Christians. He quotes the passages, he translates them, he explains them, he gives indexes of all the subjects, persons, places, texts referred to in them, and of the passages themselves. His book (if he is right in his identification of the Minim) is a history of Judaizing Christianity, the first independent and competent history written in English.

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE NEW TESTAMENT.

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE NEW TESTAMENT. By Adolf Jülicher. Translated by Janet Penrose Ward. (*Smith, Elder, & Co.* 8vo, pp. xxi, 635. 16s.)

Jülicher's Introduction deserves translation into English, though we should like to return the compliment and see an English introduction, say by Sanday, translated into German. For Jülicher is one-sided. The other side, however, is already represented in Jülicher's own land. And Mrs. Humphry Ward, who writes an appreciation as a preface to her daughter's translation, sees quite clearly that between Jülicher and Zahn there is no truce possible. 'Zahn's vast and learned work is the antithesis and the denial of all that the Marburg professor holds true; with whom lies the future?' It would have been a more natural use of language to say that the Marburg professor denies all that Zahn holds true; for in the matter of *denial* Jülicher leaves Zahn out of sight. But there is no doubt about their antagonism. It is with one or the other that the future lies, it cannot lie with both. Mrs. Humphry Ward is confident that it lies with Jülicher. 'Can any one doubt,' she asks, 'who looks abroad a little over the general forces and tendencies, the efforts and victories of modern historical *Wissenschaft*?' And even as she writes, Dr. James Drummond, the head of the Manchester College in Oxford, the one man from whom Mrs. Humphry Ward would be likely to get most efficient encouragement, publishes his great book on the problem of the Fourth Gospel, and declares that it was written by the Apostle John.

It is the section on the Fourth Gospel that is weakest in Jülicher. He feels that himself. In

the second (1900) edition, of which this is a translation, he has tried to do more justice to the Fourth Gospel and Acts, confessing in the preface that they 'had previously come off but poorly.' But justice to them means justice to his own prejudice against them. The man has gone a long way in depreciation of 'St. John' who can say, 'I know of no point, in fact, in which our knowledge of the life of Jesus receives an incontestible increase through the Fourth Gospel' (p. 419). So he adds: 'Instead of the parables of the Synoptics, we have here, at most, colourless allegories and ambiguous metaphors; instead of their pithy practical wisdom, we find theological speculation; instead of the constant relation to actual circumstances and events, the prevailing character of timelessness' (p. 420). He finds the bias, of course, not in himself, but in the Gospel. 'It is throughout apologetic. The Gospel history is arranged and adapted in the most uncompromising manner with a view to repelling Jewish insinuations against the Gospel as it had hitherto existed.'

Yet Jülicher was worth translating. His Introduction is (away from the Fourth Gospel and the Acts) a moderate statement of the naturalistic attitude, and full of fine discrimination. To the believer in inspiration it is shockingly irreverent; but it is not immoral, nor even unspiritual. It is bracing as a good nor-easter, if you can stand up to it.

Jülicher has a large idea of what an Introduction to the New Testament should cover. When he has finished the books of the New Testament, he begins the history of the Canon. This forms the second part of the book. When that is finished he begins the history of the Text, which forms the third part. These parts are short and masterly; and they give the book a unique comprehensiveness, which is another good reason for its translation into English.

THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

THE CHARACTER AND AUTHORSHIP OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL. By James Drummond, M.A., LL.D., Hon. Litt. D. (*Williams & Norgate.* 8vo, pp. 528. 10s. 6d.)

It is easy to see why an unbeliever in the Divinity of Christ should feel the force of the arguments against the Johannine authorship of the Fourth Gospel. It is easy to see why his testimony should carry peculiar weight when these arguments fail to

convince him. The impression made by Ezra Abbot's defence of the apostolic authorship a generation ago was very great; not less will be the impression made on our generation by the defence of the head of Manchester College, Oxford.

To see where we are, let us quote his conclusion. It will not be necessary to do much more—

'We have now gone carefully through the arguments against the reputed authorship of the Gospel, and on the whole have found them wanting. Several appear to be quite destitute of weight; others present some difficulty; one or two occasion real perplexity. But difficulties are not proofs, and we have always to consider whether greater difficulty is not involved in rejecting a proposition than in accepting it. This seems to me to be the case in the present instance. The external evidence (be it said with due respect for the Alogi) is all on one side, and for my part I cannot easily repel its force. A considerable mass of internal evidence is in harmony with the external. A number of the difficulties which have been pressed against the conclusion thus indicated melt away on nearer examination, and those which remain are not sufficient to weigh down the balance. In literary questions we cannot look for demonstration, and where opinion is so much divided we must feel some uncertainty in our conclusions; but on weighing the arguments for and against to the best of my power, I must give my own judgment in favour of the Johannine authorship.'

The contrast between Dr. Drummond and Professor Jülicher is wholly to the advantage of the former. Dr. Drummond makes no broad statements of disparagement. He does not carelessly speak of St. John's 'timelessness.' He does not brand him with the nickname of apologist. All the New Testament writers are apologetic; they could not write in any other way; they would not have considered any other writing worth the paper and ink. Dr. Drummond does not find that St. John is as objective as a Freeman or a Stubbs. But he finds that his purpose was so to write that we might believe that Jesus is the Christ, and to that purpose he used the knowledge both of the life and the mind of Jesus which none but he could have possessed.

There are no general charges. The ground is carefully and slowly covered and conquered. And even if there are left some small posts in the enemies' hands, they do not seem impregnable.

In mere scholarship, in arrangement, in temper, no German work will compare with it.

THE LIFE OF JESUS.

THE LIFE OF JESUS. By Oscar Holtzmann, D.D. Translated by J. T. Bealby, B.A., and M. A. Canney. (*A. & C. Black.* 8vo, pp. xiii, 542. 15s. net.)

There are men who would have written a life of Christ, but shrank from the difficulty of it. Professor Holtzmann is not one of these. He would not have been afraid to write a new Gospel, if it had been fashionable in our day to write Gospels. He would have laid it alongside our four, as he lays the Gospel of the Hebrews, and would not have been afraid of the comparison.

If Professor Holtzmann had written a new Gospel here is an example of the way he would have written it. Receiving from tradition the words, 'Foxes have holes, and birds of the air have nests, but the Son of man hath not where to lay his head,' he would have explained that when Jesus contrasts the 'son of man' with fickle or treacherous animals, he means any man of noble sentiments and not merely the Messiah. And then he would have made this memorable contribution: 'Man, it is true, mostly builds himself a better house than the foxes' holes or the birds' nests; but he also requires more materials for it, and it costs him more pains. Thus there are often homeless men, while it would very seldom appear that the creatures named cannot find a shelter. In this case, however, the contrast between man and the animals is typical of the contradiction which frequently exists between men's worth and their fortune.'

That is how Professor Holtzmann does actually write his *Life of Jesus*. There is plenty more of that. Was it worth the trouble of translation? There never was a better translation. Perhaps it is the very excellence of the translation that makes the matter seem so poor. In the solemn big-worded German it sounded well enough. But in idiomatic English it reads almost like a joke.

We freely admit that Holtzmann's *Life of Jesus* is one of the best of its kind. If it is necessary that those who cannot read German should know the kind of Lives of Christ that fall so thick in Germany, a better example probably could not have been found. It is its kind that is so bad. If the Jesus of these Lives were the genuine Jesus

fewer Lives of Him would have been written. If He had been bad, a conscious and deliberate impostor, there would have been some piquancy about Him. But to have been merely goody-goody!

Professor Holtzmann makes desperate efforts to get rid of the miraculous, but here is a greater miracle than any other, that a merely goody person should have been the Founder of Christianity.

RELIGIOUS, ETHICAL, AND THEOLOGICAL ARTICLES IN THE PERIODICALS OF 1903.

ABBREVIATIONS.

AJP = American Journal of Philology.

AJT = American Journal of Theology.

BS = Bibliotheca Sacra.

BSt = Bible Student.

BW = Biblical World.

Cl.R = Classical Review.

CR = Critical Review.

CS = Church and Synagogue.

CQR = Church Quarterly Review.

CUB = Catholic University Bulletin.

E = Expositor.

H = Hermathena.

HJ = Hibbert Journal.

HR = Homiletic Review.

IR = Independent Review.

JBL = Journal of Biblical Literature.

JTS = Journal of Theological Studies.

JQR = Jewish Quarterly Review.

LQR = London Quarterly Review.

PEFSt = Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly Statement.

PM = Preacher's Magazine.

PMQR = Primitive Methodist Quarterly Review.

PSBA = Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology.

PTR = Princeton Theological Review.

UM = Union Magazine.

WMM = Wesleyan Methodist Magazine.

Acts, Credibility, CQR iv. 388-405.

Advocate in 1 John, E viii. 321-344. G. G. Findlay.

Aeschylus, Morality in, HJ ii. 83-93. L. Campbell.

Agape, CUB ix. 465-508. J. M. Gillis.

Age, Old, LQR ix. 269-293. J. A. Thomson.

Agnosticism, HJ ii. 110-124. C. F. Dole.

Ain-et-Tâbiga, PEFSt 160.

Ambrosiaster, E viii. 442-455. A. Souter.

Amos, BW xxi. 371-374. D. L. Pierson.

Andrew, PM xiv. 481-487. J. G. Tasker.

Apologetics, Modern, AJT vii. 523-544. G. T. Ladd.

„ New, BW xxi. 38-45, W. P. Merrill; xxi. 129-138, M. S. Terry; xxi. 191-196, W. D. Mackenzie; xxi. 284-290, J. M. Coulter.

„ Practical Importance, PTR i. 200-226. W. B. Greene.

Apologetic Value of O.T., PM xiv. 12-18. J. T. L. Maggs.

Apostolic Missionary Methods, E vii. 387-400, viii. 73, 80, 227-240. T. Zahn.

Arabians, CS v. 87-91. W. O. E. Oesterley.

Archæology of O.T., BW xxii. 116-128. G. S. Duncan.

Aristeas' Letter, Translation JQR xv. 337-391. H. St. J. Thackeray.

Armenian Church, Animal Sacrifice, AJT vii. 62-90. F. C. Conybeare.

Ashtaroth Karnaim, PEFSt 225.

Asurbanipal's Chronology, PSBA xxv. 82-89. C. H. W. Johns.

Athanasius MSS, JTS v. 108-115. K. Lake.

Atonement, Modern Theories, PTR i. 81-92. B. B. Warfield.

„ Working Theory, BW xxii. 284-289. W. W. M'Lane.

„ and the Modern Mind, E viii. 81-105, 161-182, 241-266. J. Denney.

Augustine's Confessions, AJT vii. 500-514. B. B. Warfield.

Australia, Church in, CQR lvii. 146-166.

Authority in Religion, HJ i. 677-692. W. Ward.

Auto da Fé and Jews, JQR xv. 413-439, xvi. 135-142. E. N. Adler.

BABYLON and the Bible, HJ ii. 65-82. T. K. Cheyne.

„ „ Israel, PTR i. 239-255. R. D. Wilson.

Babylonian Religion, PSBA xxv. 23-29, 75-81. A. Boissier.

Beatitudes, BW xxii. 83-87.

Bernard of Clairvaux, PTR i. 180-199. D. S. Schaff.

Bethabara, PEFSt 161.

Beth-Dagon, PEFSt 356.

Bethlehem of Galilee, PEFSt 159. H. Rix.

Bible as a Book, Blau on, JQR xv. 715-728. E. H. Adler.

Bible and Experience, BW xxi. 323-328.

„ Familiarity, BW xxi. 260-273.

„ Historical Study, BW xxi. 426-432. R. Rhees.

„ Influence, BW xxi. 243-247.

„ Latest Translation, BS lx. 109-120, 341-350. H. M. Whitney.

„ Myth and Fiction, BW xxii. 342-357.

„ Text, PSBA xxv. 15-22, 90-98. H. H. Howorth.

„ „ Pre-Massoretic, PSBA xxv. 34-56. S. A. Cook.

Biblical Science Problems, JBL xxii. 1-15. B. W. Bacon.

Birth in Modern Palestine, BW xxii. 248-257. E. W. G. Masterman.

Bishops of St. Andrews, JTS iv. 593-606, v. 115-123. J. Dowden.

Body, Psychical and Pneumatic, BS lx. 487-494. J. D. Boardman.

Brahministic Parallels in Apocryphal N.T., AJT vii. 308-313. L. H. Gray.

Browning's Poetry, HJ i. 363-373. C. W. Stubbs.

Buddhism as a Living Force, HJ i. 465-486. T. W. Rhys Davids.

Burial Cave at Gezer, PEFSt 12, 50, 179.

CALENDAR, Jewish, CS v. 25-27. G. H. Box.

Calvin's Work, BS lx. 148-157. H. D. Foster.

Canon of N.T., BW xxi. 115-119. B. W. Bacon.

Canons of Hippolytus, JTS iv. 282-285. J. Arendzen.

Capernaum, Site, JTS v. 42-48. W. Sanday.

Catholic, Name and Thing, AJT vii. 417-442. C. A. Briggs.

 " " CR xiii. 291-303. M. A. R. Tucker.

Catholicism, Liberal, in England, HJ i. 704-712, P. Sidney; ii. 146-150, E. L. Taunton.

Catastrophes and Moral Order, HJ i. 360, 570.

Celtic Philology, CUB ix. 179-190. J. J. Dun.

Certainties of Religion, HR xlv. 413-416. G. F. Wright.

Certitude in Religion, PTR i. 138-148. B. B. Warfield.

Chantry, the Old English, CUB ix. 1-39. C. Holland.

China and the Gospel, BS lx. 371-376. D. B. M'Cartee.

China, Orthodox Philosophy, AJT vii. 41-61. G. W. Knox.

Christ and the Law, BW xxii. 163-166.

 " " Christianity, BS lx. 454-479. A. A. Shaw.

 " " Character, HJ i. 641-660. F. G. Peabody.

 " " Crucifixion, BW xxii. 180-194. C. G. Shaw.

 " " in O.T., BS lx. 738-749. H. T. Sell.

 " " Inner Life, LQR ix. 294-303. J. G. Tasker.

 " " Life in St. Mark, E viii. 106-115, 306-317, 397-400. W. H. Bennett.

 " " Questions, UM iii. 34-37, J. Denney; iii. 70-72, G. Reith; iii. 111-115, A. M. Stewart; iii. 155-158, R. Glaister; iii. 222-224, R. S. Simpson; iii. 269-271, W. Dickie; iii. 314-317, D. W. Forrest; iii. 410-413, H. R. Mackintosh; iii. 468-470, D. H. Lawrence; iii. 508-510, E. Heath; iii. 560-562, J. T. Ferguson.

 " " Resurrection, E viii. 344-360. D. Smith.

 " " Teaching on Himself, PTR i. 573-636. J. P. Sheraton.

 " " Teaching, E vii. 81-94, 259-273, 401-416; viii. 116-130, 267-282, 440-455. H. B. Swete.

 " " Trial, BS lx. 495-509. H. M. Cheever.

 " " Work, BW xxi. 356-365. C. G. Shaw.

Christianity and Culture, WMM cxvi. 106-110. J. G. Tasker.

 " " and Judaism, E vii. 241-258. A. F. Kirkpatrick.

 " " Essence, CR xiii. 483-489. H. R. Mackintosh.

Chronicles, Greek Versions, PSBA xxv. 139. C. C. Torrey.

Clapham Sect, WMM cxvi. 363-370. T. M'Cullagh.

Clement of Alexandria, Christology, JTS v. 123-127. V. Ermoni.

Codex Claromontanus, JTS iv. 587 ff. F. C. Burkitt.

 " " k of the O.L. Gospels, JTS v. 88-100, C. H. Turner; v. 100-108, F. C. Burkitt.

Colleges, Christianity in, PTR i. 256-266. D. W. Fisher.

Commandments, Hebrew Papyrus of the Ten, JQR xv. 392-408. F. C. Burkitt.

Confession and Absolution, CQR lv. 300-320.

Conversion, Psychology, CQR lvi. 17-40.

Corinthians (II.), H xxix. 340-367. J. H. Kennedy.

Creation and Social Ideal, AJT vii. 20-40. H. S. Nash.

 " " Prayer, BS lx. 297-307. C. Greeley.

Creed of Constantinople, JTS iv. 285-290. N. Orloff.

Creeds, Obligation of, IR i. 92-114. W. Sanday.

Crucifixion, E viii. 434-441. N. J. D. White.

Cruelty in Nature, HR xlv. 419-423. W. C. Wilkinson.

Culture and Christianity, WMM cxvi. 106, 110. J. G. Tasker.

 " " Papacy, WMM cxvi. 255-259. J. G. Tasker.

Cutha, BW xxii. 61-64. E. J. Banks.

Cyprus, Orthodox Church, CQR lvi. 313-328.

DAMASCUS, Water Supply, BW xxi. 98-107. E. W. G. Masterman.

Daniel, Critical View, HR xlv. 3-9. C. M. Cobern.

Dante's Imperialism, CQR lvii. 167-187.

Dante Literature, HJ i. 624-630. P. H. Wicksteed.

Day, Greek, AJP xxiii. 428-436. G. M. Bolling.

Dead Sea, Religion, BW xxi. 327-346. P. Cady.

 " " PEFSt 94, 177.

Death in Mod. Palestine, BW xxii. 248-257. E. W. G. Masterman.

 " " Plato's Conception, HJ ii. 98-109. B. Bosanquet.

Deification in Palestine, BW xxi. 7-16. S. I. Curtiss.

Dervish Festival in Morocco, WMM i. 196-201. K. E. Wykes.

Descent, PMQR xxv. 140-152. R. Hind.

Deuteronomy, Laws Peculiar, PTR i. 434-456. G. C. Cameron.

Döllinger, Life, AJT vii. 733-743. W. Rauschenbusch.

Dyaus, JQR xv. 559 ff. A. H. Keane.

EA, JQR xv. 559 ff. A. H. Keane.

Ecclesiastes, BW xxii. 268-283. G. W. Gilmore.

Ecclesiasticism, IR i. 115-131. G. L. Dickinson.

Edersheim, Alfred, CS v. 93-100. W. T. Gidney.

Education of the Jew, CS v. 7-25, 74-87, 110-120. G. H. Box.

 " " Religious, BW xxi. 440-446, G. A. Coe; xxii. 54-60, D. Beaton; xxii. 424-435, E. L. Curtiss.

 " " Religious and Moral, BW xxi. 83-97, 297-301.

Egypt, Book of the Dead, PSBA xxv. 3-10, 67-70, 105-110, 167-172, 237-242, 268-271, E. Naville.

 " " in the Sept. AJT vii. 292. H. A. Redpath.

 " " and Syria, BS lx. 92-108. W. M. Patton.

Egyptian Jewelry, BW xxii. 64-66. J. H. Breasted.

 " " Transliteration, PSBA xxv. 57-61, E. Naville; xxv. 162, J. Lieblein; xxv. 209-214, J. Krall and A. Wiedemann; xxv. 288-293, E. Reville.

Election, PM xiv. 346-353. J. Berry.

England and Rome in Middle Ages, CQR. lvi. 118-142.

 " " Literature and Christian Culture, BS lx. 698-717. H. M. Whitney.

Enoch, Book, AJT vii. 689-703. R. H. Charles.

Ephod, CS v. 50-51. W. O. E. Oesterley.

Eschatology of Paul, BW xxii. 36-41. S. MacComb.

Esther, Authenticity, PTR i. 62-74. W. S. Watson.

Eternal Life, BW xxii. 436-448. C. G. Shaw.

Ethics of Labour Unions, CUB ix. 455-464. W. J. Kerby.

 " " of O.T., BW xxi. 108-114, 197-205. G. R. Berry.

Ethiopia in the Sept., AJT vii. 292. H. H. Redpath.

- Eucharist, History, CQR iv. 321-340, lvi. 51-75.
 Eudæmonism, LQR ix. 335, 354. C. C. Dove.
 Euripides as Preacher of Righteousness, LQR x. 301-334.
 A. S. Way.
 Eusebius, IJ i. 781-788. W. R. Cassels.
 Evangelicalism in Dublin, HJ i. 498-509. J. P. Mahaffy.
 Evangelism, New Era, PTR i. 227-238. D. R. Breed.
 Eve's Creation, BS ix. 121-128. S. W. Howland.
 Evolution, St. Paul and, HJ ii. 1-9. E. Caird.
 „ and Theology To-day, PTR i. 403-442. W. R. Johnson.
 Ewald, BW xxii. 407-415. J. M. P. Smith.
 Exegesis, Primitive, JQR xv. 627-631. J. H. A. Hart.
 Experience, Psychology of, BS ix. 1-27. A. A. Berle.
 Ezekiel, Greek Translators, JTS iv. 398-411. H. St. J. Thackeray.
 FAITH of God, PMQR xxv. 427-435. F. W. Lewis.
 Fatherhood of God, CR xiii. 316-323. H. R. Mackintosh.
 „ „ E viii. 24-40. G. S. Streatfield.
 Fathers, Age of, CQR lvi. 288-312.
 Fall as Compositive Narrative, BS ix. 84-91. W. W. Martin.
 Flood, HR xlv. 258-262. G. H. Shodde.
 „ Bible Teaching, HR xlv. 298-305. G. F. Wright.
 „ Hero of, PSBA xxv. 113-122, 195-201. T. G. Pinches.
 Flood and Science, E viii. 456-472. J. G. Bonney.
 Forgiveness of Sins, BS ix. 158-170. W. H. Walker.
 Frederick II., the Hohenstaufe, AJT vii. 225-248. W. Köhler.
 Future Life in Israel, E vii. 49-64. R. H. Charles.
 GATE of Nicanor, PEFSt 125. Clermont-Ganneau.
 Gaul, Learning in Middle Ages, AJT vii. 443-451. A. H. Wilde.
 German Poetry, BS ix. 480-486. J. Lindsay.
 Gezer, Excavation, PEFSt 1-50, 107-123, 195-231, 299-322, R. A. S. Macalister; BW xxi. 407-425, E. W. G. Masterman; PEFSt 284-298, C. W. Wilson.
 Geraldus Cambrensis, CQR iv. 341-362.
 Gnosticism, PTR i. 616-623. J. Lindsay.
 God as Spirit, E viii. 195-201. J. H. Bernard.
 „ in the Church, BS ix. 718-737. H. W. Hulbert.
 „ in the Epistle to the Ephesians, BSt vii. 133-137. R. A. Webb.
 „ N. Amer. Ind. Idea, AJT vii. 635-646. L. M. Conard.
 Golden Legend, CQR lvii. 29-51; PTR i. 267-281. E. C. Richardson.
 Golgotha, PEFSt 51-65, 140-153, 242-249. C. W. Wilson.
 Gospel, Commendation, BW xxii. 1-7.
 Gospels in Syriac, CQR lvi. 143-171.
 „ Weiss' Text, AJT vii. 251-258. K. Lake.
 Greek of N.T., Cl.R xvii. 93-96. A. N. Jannaris.
 „ (Biblical) Tenses, JTS iv. 279-282. F. W. Mozley.
 Gregorianum, Early MSS, JTS iv. 411-426. E. Bishop.
 Guardian Angels, BSt vii. 1-9. B. B. Warfield.
 Gyges Tale, AJP xxiii. 361-387. K. F. Smith.
 HABAKKUK, AJT vii. 647-661. W. R. Betteridge.
 Hammurabi's Code, BW xxi. 175-190, C. F. Kent; JTS iv. 172-183, C. H. W. Johns.
 Harnack, CUB ix. 206-224. H. Moynihan.
 Hebrews, Epistle as Work of Barnabas, E viii. 381-396. J. V. Bartlet.
 Heredity, PM xiv. 433-440. W. T. A. Barber.
 Heretics, Jewish Prayer against, CS v. 167-171. G. H. Box.
 High Place at Gezer, PEFSt 317.
 „ „ Petra, BW xxi. 167-174. F. E. Hoskins.
 Hittite Inscriptions, PSBA xxv. 141-156, 173-194, 277-287. A. H. Sayce.
 Home, BW xxi. 1-6.
 Hyksos in Egypt, BW xxi. 347-355. A. H. Sayce.
 IMMORTALITY and Optimism, HJ i. 425-440. G. L. Dickinson.
 „ in In Memoriam, LQR x. 335-360. J. D. Thompson.
 India, Romanism, WMM cxvii. 524-530, 583-589. J. S. W. Shrewsbury.
 Indian Missions, Failure, HJ i. 487-497, J. Oldfield; i. 661-676, W. Miller; i. 799-802, G. F. Deas.
 Individual, Primacy, LQR ix. 80-102. A. Boutwood.
 Infallibility, LQR ix. 319-334. R. B. Workman.
 Infant Sacrifice at Gezer, PEFSt 33.
 Infidelity, Popular, LQR x. 1-24. J. Orr.
 Inquisition (Spanish) and Jews, JQR xv. 182-250. R. J. H. Gottheil.
 „ at Venice, JTS v. 127 f. R. L. Poole.
 Interpretation, BS ix. 334-341. D. K. Davis.
 „ Ancient and Modern, LQR ix. 1-23. G. G. Findlay.
 „ Scientific, BW xxi. 163-166.
 Irish Churches, CQR iv. 257-277.
 Irving, PTR i. 1-22. M. C. Williams.
 Israelites, CS v. 44-47. W. O. E. Oesterley.
 Israel, Religion, BSt vii. 17-23. M. G. Kyle.
 Italian Poetry, BS ix. 308-314. J. Lindsay.
 Italian Renaissance, CUB ix. 315-331. T. J. Shahan.
 JEHOVAH in Abraham's Age, E viii. 282-293. C. H. W. Johns.
 Jehovah-Worship, Origin, CS v. 122-132. W. O. E. Oesterley.
 Jerahmeel, UM iii. 413-416. J. M. Wilson.
 Jeremiah, BW xxii. 98-106, 195-208. A. R. Gordon.
 „ Greek Translators, JTS iv. 245-266. H. St. J. Thackeray.
 Jerusalem, Church of St. Mary, PEFSt 250-257, 344-355. C. M. Watson.
 „ of David and Solomon, BW xxii. 8-21. G. A. Barton.
 „ History and Topography, E vii. 1-21, 298-315, 321-337. G. A. Smith.
 „ Name, E vii. 122-135. G. A. Smith.
 „ Underground, BW xxii. 167-179. J. L. Leeper.
 „ Wall, JBL xxii. 85-164. H. G. Mitchell.
 „ Waters, E vii. 208-228. G. A. Smith.
 Jewish Literature, Is there a, JQR xv. 583-603. S. Levy.

- Jewish Scholarship and Christian Silence, *HJ* i. 335-346, 141 f., C. G. Montefiore; i. 789-792, A. Menzies.
- „ War, Inscriptions, *PSBA* xxv. 30-33. J. Offord.
- Jews and Auto da Fé, *JQR* xv. 413-439, xvi. 135-142. E. N. Adler.
- „ of the Dispersion, *PSBA* xxv. 225-233, 250-258. E. J. Pilcher.
- „ in India, *CS* v. 100-109, 133-142. J. H. Low.
- „ in Middle Ages, *BC* lx. 547-571. D. S. Schaff.
- „ in Modern Palestine, *BW* xxi. 17-27, 274-280, xxii. 88-97. E. W. G. Masterman.
- „ of Moldavia, *JQR* xvi. 113-134. E. Schwartzfeld.
- „ in Portugal, *JQR* xv. 251-274, 529 f. C. de Bethencourt.
- „ and Spanish Inquisition, *JQR* xv. 182-250. R. T. H. Gottheil.
- Joan of Arc, *CQR* lvii. 131-145.
- John's Gospel, Date *BS* lx. 244-260. C. W. Rishell.
- „ „ Recent Discussion, *HJ* i. 510-531. B. W. Bacon.
- „ „ Wendt's Theory, *E* vii. 65-80, 135-146, G. W. Stewart; *H* xxix. 322-339, F. R. M. Hitchcock; *JTS* iv. 194-205, W. Lock.
- Jonathan, *BSt* viii. 267-273. D. J. Woods.
- Joseph's Egyptian Name, *PSBA* xxv. 157-161. E. Naville.
- Judaism and Jewish Evangelisation, *LQR* ix. 43-61. T. Nicol.
- Judaism, Conservative View, *JQR* xvi 9-29. L. Magnus.
- „ Reform Movement, *JQR* xv. 475-521, xvi. 30-72. D. Philipson.
- Judgment Day, *BS* lx. 379-383. E. B. Fairfield.
- Jupiter, *JQR* xv. 559 ff. A. H. Keane.
- Justification, Is St. Paul's Legal, *PTR* i. 161-179. G. Vos.
- KIPLING, Religious Message, *UM* iii. 416-420. W. L. Stephen.
- Knowledge of God, *E* viii. 455-467. G. G. Findlay.
- LABOUR and Free Trade, *IR* i. 208-222. J. Burns.
- Labour Unions, Ethics, *CUB* ix. 455-464. W. J. Kirby.
- „ „ Mission, *BS* lx. 129-147. C. W. Eliot.
- Lamp and Bowl Deposits at Gezer, *PEFSt* 306.
- Last Supper and Jewish Passover, *CS* v. 120-122. G. H. Box.
- Law (Physical) and Life, *HJ* i. 728-746. J. H. Poynting.
- Leo XIII., *CUB* ix. 447-454. T. J. Shahan.
- Levant Missions, *PTR* i. 384-402. J. F. Riggs.
- Liberty (Religious) in U.S.A., *CUB* ix. 61-77. L. Johnston.
- Literature in relation to Preaching, *PM* xiv. 539-544. J. S. Cooper.
- Loisy, Theology, *HJ* ii. 142-146.
- London, Religion, *CQR* lvi. 257-276.
- Lord's Supper in Luke, *JTS* iv. 548-555. H. E. D. Blakison.
- „ „ objective Aspect, *E* vii. 180-198. H. R. Mackintosh.
- Lost Tribes, *JQR* xv. 640-676. A. M. Hyamson.
- M'Cosh (James), *PTR* i. 337-361. A. T. Ormond.
- Man, *HR* xlv. 291-298. G. Macloskie.
- „ Antiquity, *HR* xlv. 218-223. J. K. Richardson.
- Man, Early History, *BS* lx. 28-32, G. F. Wright; *BS* lx. 572-578. L. A. Owen.
- „ Origin, *BS* lx. 261-276. G. Macloskie.
- Manuscripts F and G (Pauline), *AJT* vii. 452-485, 662-688. W. B. Smith.
- „ (Hebrew-Persian) of B.M., *JQR* xv. 278-301. M. Seligsohn.
- „ Latin, *JTS* iv. 426-434. C. H. Turner.
- MS., New, of N.T., *BW* xxi. 140-145. J. H. Ropes.
- Marriage, among Jews, *CS* v. 74-87. G. H. Box.
- „ in Modern Palestine, *BW* xxii. 248-257. E. W. G. Masterman.
- „ of Near Kin, *CUB* ix. 40-60. J. W. Melody.
- Martineau (James), *E* vii. 22-36, J. Wedgwood; *HJ* i. 253-271, J. Watson; *LQR* ix. 209-235, W. T. Davison.
- Martineau's Philosophy, *HJ* i. 441-464. A. S. Pringle-Pattison.
- Maurice and the Broad Church, *E* vii. 161-180. J. Wedgwood.
- Medieval Papacy, *CUB* ix. 347-368. L. Johnston.
- Metaphysical Needs, *BS* lx. 633-648. J. Lindsay.
- Methodism, *LQR* x. 133-155. J. G. Tasker.
- „ in Wales, *CQR* lvii. 80-100.
- Milton's Epic Verse, *PTR* i. 101-110. T. W. Hunt.
- Ministerial Success, *PTR* i. 75-80. W. Irvin.
- Minor Prophets, O.L. Texts, *JTS* v. 76-88. W. O. E. Oesterley.
- Miracle, Law, Evolution, *BS* lx. 750-764. C. B. Warring.
- Miracles, *BSt* vii. 9-17. W. M. M'Pheeters.
- „ Mediate, *HR* xlv. 18-23. G. F. Wright.
- Mission Lights on Theology, *UM* iii. 403-407, 449-452. J. C. Gibson.
- Missions to Hindoos, *CQR* lvi. 172-195.
- Moberly (R.C.), *JTS* iv. 481-499. W. Sanday.
- Mommsen, *IR* i. 465-470. H. F. Pelham.
- Monasteries (Greek) in S. Italy, *JTS* iv. 345-368, 517-542, v. 22-41. K. Lake.
- Montanism, *E* vii. 284-298. E. C. Selwyn.
- Moral Ideal, Old and New Aspects, *HJ* i. 294-308. L. Campbell.
- Moral Issue, *IR* i. 193-207.
- Morality in Aeschylus, *HJ* ii. 83-97. L. Campbell.
- Mormon Hierarchy, *HR* xlv. 199-206. S. E. Wishard.
- Mormonism, *BS* lx. 171-176. L. A. M. Bosworth.
- Mosaic Age, *HR* xlv. 483-486. A. H. Sayce.
- Music, in Worship, *AJT* vii. 276-288. G. C. Gow.
- „ N.T., *WMM* cxvii. 830-832, 913-916. H. Elderskin.
- Mysticism, New, *LQR* x. 239-260. W. B. Dalby.
- Mystics, Modern, *CQR* lvi. 333-343.
- NAMES in Scripture from St. Gall MS., *JTS* iv. 218-244. M. R. James.
- Names of Places in O.T., *PEFSt* 356.
- Neander, *CS* v. 1-7. W. T. Gidney.
- New Testament Greek, *PTR* i. 631-636. S. Dickey.
- Nippur, Excavation, *AJT* vii. 712-730. J. P. Peters.
- Nonjurors, *LQR* ix. 236-251. E. E. Kellett.
- Norway, Theology, *JTS* v. 1-21, J. Beveridge; *CR* xiii. 99-108, 304-310. J. Beveridge.
- Norway, O.T. Study, *CR* xiii. 490-499. J. Beveridge.

- OLD Testament Study, HJ i. 747-762. T. K. Cheyne.
 „ „ in Education, BW xxii. 424-435. E. L. Curtis.
- Optimism and Immortality, HJ i. 425-440. G. L. Dickinson; HJ ii. 250-255. A. Pinchard.
- Orders, Reluctance to take, HJ i. 713-727. P. S. Burrell.
- Originality and Inspiration, UM iii. 549-552. H. Morrison.
- PALÆOGRAPHY and its Uses, JTS iv. 506-516. A. Souter.
- Palestine Excavations, CS v. 157-167. W. O. E. Oesterley.
 „ Exploration, JBL xxii. 15-32. J. D. Prince;
 xxii. 164-187. G. A. Barton.
 „ Modern, PEFSt 65-77, 162-170. P. G. Baldensperger.
- Papacy and Culture, WMM cxxvi. 255-259. J. G. Tasker.
- Papyri, Hebrew and Aramaic, JQR xvi. 1-8. A. Cowley.
- Paradise on Earth (in O.T.), CUB ix. 225-237. G. J. Reid.
- Park (E. A.), BS lx. 201-222. J. E. Rankin.
 „ „ Theology, BS lx. 672-697. F. H. Foster.
- Passover and Lord's Supper, JTS iv. 184-193. J. C. Lambert.
- Patriarchs, Historicity, HR xlv. 195-199. A. H. Sayce.
- Paul and Evolution, HJ ii. 1-19. E. Baird.
 „ Eschatology, BW xxii. 36-41. S. MacComb.
 „ Method of Evangelisation, BW xxii. 416-423. E. I. Bosworth.
 „ Preaching, BSt vii. 210-217. S. McLanahan.
 „ Righteousness of God, JBL xxii. 211-227. J. H. Ropes.
 „ Speeches, BSt vii. 198-204. J. Ritchie Smith.
 „ Theology, its Genesis, BS lx. 61-83. W. H. H. Marsh.
- Paul's Inspiration, BSt vii. 259-264. W. B. Greene.
 „ Name for God, PM xiv. 544-549. R. J. Wardell.
 „ Prayers, BSt vii. 204-210, 270-277. S. T. Lowrie.
 „ Theology, BSt vii. 286-292. F. R. Beattie; BSt vii. 332-340. G. Vos; BSt viii. 134-147. A. C. Zenos.
- Pelagianism, PTR i. 457-462. B. B. Warfield.
- Penitential Discipline in First Three Centuries, JTS iv. 321-337. H. B. Swete.
- Pentateuch, Sam.-Heb., JQR xv. 632-639. G. Margoliouth.
- Perfection, BW xxii. 243-247.
- Persian Biblical Edicts, CR xiii. 125-132. L. H. Mills.
- Person in Education, BS lx. 510-546. H. C. King.
- Personality, Religious View, JTS iv. 161-171. R. C. Moberly.
- Peter of Alex., JTS iv. 387-397. W. E. Crum.
- Petra, High Place at, BW xxi. 167-174. F. E. Hoskins.
- Philistines in the Sept., AJT vii. 295. H. A. Redpath.
- Philosophy, Chinese, AJT vii. 41-61. G. W. Knox.
- Philosophy, of History, BSt vii. 67-74. A. C. Zenos.
- Philosophy (of To-day) and Religion, HJ i. 228-252, ii. 20-43. H. Jones.
- Plato's Conception of Death, HJ ii. 98-109. B. Bosanquet.
- Poetry, of Hebrews, BW xxii. 358-362. T. W. Davies.
 „ of OT., HR xlv. 120-126. E. König.
- Pottery at Gezer, PEFSt 40, 120, 204, 304.
- Prayer for the Dead, CQR lvi. 368-393.
- Prayer, Public, HR xlvi. 83-88. E. J. Wolf.
 „ Pulpit, HR xlvi. 251-258. W. J. Beecher.
- Preaching, PM xiv. 18-23. J. Parker.
- Prophets, Greek Translators, JTS iv. 578-585. H. St. J. Thackeray.
 „ Religion of Post-Exilic, BW xxii. 258-267. L. B. Paton.
- Propitiation, E viii. 321-344. G. G. Findlay.
- Prosody, Problems, BS lx. 33-60. H. W. Magoun.
- Protestantism, PM xiv. 408-410. W. F. Moulton.
- Proverbs, Self-Control, BSt viii. 325-329. E. B. Pollard.
- Psalms 110, JTS iv. 338-344. E. G. King.
- Psalms, Imprecatory, PTR i. 537-553. C. Martin.
 „ Poetry, BW xxii. 42-48. W. T. Allison.
- Psychology of Christian Experience, BS lx. 1-27. A. A. Berle.
- Puritan Utopia, CQR lvii. 101-130.
- REDEMPTION, Pauline Doctrine, LQR x. 25-54. S. MacComb.
- Reformation, Do We believe in It, HJ i. 693-703. W. F. Cobb.
 „ Scottish, PM xiv. 498-503. J. Lindsay.
- Religion and Culture, PM xiv. 255-263. A. E. Balch.
 „ and Morality, AJT vii. 259-275. C. G. Shaw.
 „ Credibility, LQR x. 1-24. J. Orr.
 „ How to Teach, BS lx. 422-453. A. A. Berle.
 „ in Germany at Reformation, LQR x. 209-238. T. M. Lindsay.
 „ in London, LQR x. 77-96. J. S. Lidgett.
- Restoration, Church and Clergy after, CQR lv. 278-299.
- Resurrection of Unjust, BSt viii. 288-295. J. W. Primrose.
- Revelation or Discovery, PTR i. 423-433. A. C. Zenos.
- Revised Version with References, E viii. 1-12. T. H. Stokoe.
- Revivals, HR xlv. 9-17, 99-109, J. Cook; HR xlv. 206-213, D. J. Burrell.
- Righteousness of God, HJ i. 272-293. J. Drummond.
- Righteousness of God in O.T. and in St. Paul, JBL xxii. 211-227. J. H. Ropes.
- Rigveda, Recent Works, Cl. R xvii. 76-78. E. V. Arnold.
- Ritschl and his Critics, PTR i. 38-50. J. Orr.
- Ritual, English and Norman, JTS iv. 206-214. W. H. Frere.
- Roman Canon, Early Texts, JTS iv. 555-578. E. Bishop.
- Roman Religion, AJP xxiv. 75-85. G. Showerman; HJ i. 590-594. W. Warde Fowler.
- Romans, Did Paul write, HJ i. 309-334, 795-797. W. B. Smith; i. 532-552. P. W. Schmiedel; i. 797 f., A. F. R. Hoernle.
- SABATIER (Aug.) and Paris School of Theology, HJ i. 553-568. G. B. Stevens.
- Sacramentaries, Irish, JTS v. 49-75. A. M. Bannister.
- Sacrifice (Animal) in Christian Church, AJT vii. 62-90. F. C. Conybeare.
 „ „ among Semites, BW xxi. 248-259. S. I. Curtiss.
- Sacrifices, JBL xxii. 45-50. S. I. Curtiss.
- Saints of Gaul, AJT vii. 443-451. A. H. Wilde.
- Samaritan Passover, PEFSt 90-93. R. G. Stafford.
 „ Pentateuch, BS lx. 601-632. W. E. Barton.
- Samuel, Ethics, BSt viii. 41-47. G. R. Berry.
 „ Religious Value, BSt viii. 74-78. J. A. Kelso.
 „ Sacrifice, BSt viii. 69-74. J. O. Boyd.

- Samuel, Spirit of God, BSt viii. 31-36. J. W. Beardslee.
 Scepticism in Religion, CUB ix. 78-93, 369-388. E. V. O'Hara.
 Science and Faith, HJ i. 209-227, O. Lodge; PTR i. 597-615. G. Macloskie,
 Science and Religion, HR xvi. 403-408. J. Orr.
 Scripture Authorship, PTR i. 362-383, 579-596. W. M. M'Pheeters.
 Seals, Seven, JBL xxii. 70-75. E. J. Goodspeed.
 Self-Sacrifice in Christ's Teaching, BW xxi. 323-326.
 Septuagint Study, AJT vii. 1-19. H. A. Redpath.
 „ Geography, AJT vii. 289-307. H. A. Redpath.
 Service-Book, Florentine, JQR xvi. 73-97. G. Margoliouth.
 Sin, in Babylonia, BW xxii. 49-51. L. S. Houghton.
 „ Pauline Doctrine, LQR x. 25-54. S. MacComb.
 „ the First, BS lx. 315-333. C. Walker.
 Sirach, JQR xv. 440-474, 604-626. C. Taylor.
 „ Corruption of Text, JQR xv. 627-631. J. H. A. Hart.
 Slavery, Attitude of Quakers, UM iii. 28-32, 75-78, 124-127. A. C. Thomas.
 Social Ideal and Creation, AJT vii. 20-40. H. S. Nash.
 Social Reform, IR i. 28-38. S. A. Barnett.
 „ Studies in a Preacher's Work, HR xlv. 493-500. H. R. Merriam.
 Sociology, BS lx. 358-370. B. T. Stafford.
 Sonship, PMQR xxv. 230-239. A. Brown.
 Spinoza's Philosophy, CR xiii. 1-13. W. Johnston.
 Spirit of Man, H xxix. 309-321. A. R. Eager.
 Stumbling Block, CS v. 154-157. V. L. Guttenberg.
 Sunday School, Curriculum, BW xxii. 129-138. S. Mathews.
 „ Kindergarten, BW xxii. 369-381, 451-458. G. W. Pease.
 Synoptic Gospels, CQR lvi. 76-95.
 „ Problem, an Illustration, PTR i. 93-100. W. T. Whitley.
 Syria in the Sept., AJT vii. 293. H. A. Redpath.
 Syriac Gospel, PM xiv. 337-346. W. Spiers.
 Syriac MSS in Vatican, CUB ix. 94-104. H. Hyvernat.
 TALMUD, BW xxii. 216-223, 294-300. D. Cook.
 Temple, Archbishop, CQR lvi. 1-16.
 Temple at Gezer, PEFSt 23, 219.
 Temple, Remains, BW xxii. 329-341. J. L. Leeper.
 Teraphim, CS v. 48-49. W. O. E. Oesterley.
 Tertullian's Use of Substantia, etc., JTS iv. 440 ff. J. F. Bethune-Baker.
 Testament of our Lord, AJT vii. 749-756. E. Nestle.
 Themison, Catholic Epistles, E viii. 40-62. T. Barns.
 Theodicy, BS lx. 401-421, 649-671. J. Cooper.
 Theology, in Preaching, PM xiv. 440-446. A. Eardley.
 „ Preachable, BS lx. 277-296. A. A. Berle.
 Thothmes IV. Tomb, PSBA xxv. 111. P. E. Newbury.
 Tiele, BW xxi. 32-37, 124-128. L. H. Jordan.
 Tolmai, Son, PM xiv. 71-74. J. A. Clapperton.
 Trades in Palestine, PEFSt 67, 162, 336.
 Transfiguration, Purpose, JTS iv. 270 ff., H. A. A. Kennedy; iv. 543-548, R. Holmes.
 Travel in Early Christianity, E viii. 401-422. W. M. Ramsay.
 Trinity, LQR ix. 120-128. R. M. Edgar.
 Troglodyte Dwellings at Gezer, PEFSt 20.
 Twelve, Companionship, E vii. 337-352. A. E. Garvie.
 UNITARIANISM, Modern, LQR ix. 209-235. W. T. Davison.
 Urim and Thummim, CS v. 51-53. W. O. E. Oesterley.
 VALUE-JUDGMENTS, E viii. 142-152, 182-194, 294-305, 360-371. A. E. Garvie.
 Vica Pota (Roman Goddess), AJP xxiv. 323-326. C. Hoeing.
 Vicarious Suffering in Nature, PTR i. 564-578. J. Cooper.
 Virgin-Birth, E vii. 198-207, N. J. D. White; HJ ii. 125-140, C. F. Beeby; LQR ix. 252-268, A. Brown.
 WAGNER and Christianity, AJT vii. 609-634. H. Weinell.
 Westcott, LQR x. 97-118. J. H. Moulton.
 West Indies, Church, CQR lvi. 41-50.
 Will of God, Doing, BW xxi. 403-406.
 Wolff, Joseph, CS v. 65-73. W. T. Gidney.
 Women among the Jews, CS v. 110-120. G. H. Box.
 Work, Gospel of, E viii. 63-72. H. Black.
 World, Salvability, BS lx. 376-378. J. B. Remensnyder.
 „ Spirituality, BS lx. 223-243. J. Bascom.
 Worship, Free Man's, IR i. 415-424. B. Russell.
 „ Music in, AJT vii. 276-288. G. C. Gow.
 YAHVEH, JQR xv. 559 ff. A. H. Keane.
 ZEND, Philology, AJP xxiv. 318-322. L. H. Mills.
 Zeus, JQR xv. 559 ff. A. H. Keane.
 Zeus, Jupiter, and the Oak, Cl.R xvii. 174-186, 268-278, 403-421. A. B. Cook.
 Zoroastrianism and Primitive Christianity, HJ i. 763-780. J. Moffatt.

The Date of Polycarp's Martyrdom in the Jewish Calendar.

BY THE REV. MATTHEW POWER, S.J., EDINBURGH.

POSTHUMOUS honours are falling thick on the illustrious author of the *Vie du Rhéteur Élius Aristide*. It is not given to many original investigators to be the subject of the unstinted praise of scholars of the rank of Professor Harnack, Bishop Lightfoot, and the brilliant band enumerated by the latter in *Apost. Fathers*, pt. ii. vol. i. p. 650. The ranks of the admirers of M. Waddington have now received a notable addition in Dr. Ramsay of Aberdeen (THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, February 1904).

Basing his researches on the earliest records of the Eastern Church, Waddington arrived at the conclusion that Polycarp suffered on the seventh day before the Kalends of March, the second day of Xanthicus, Saturday, 23rd February, 155 A.D.

Dr. Ramsay, who does not refer to the elaborate study of Bishop Lightfoot, shows some leanings to 166 A.D., the date favoured by Eusebius, and introduces a new element of difficulty arising from the uncertainty of the years of the proconsulship of Quadratus in Asia. I venture to think that this external factor is not enough to make us withhold our final assent to Waddington, and that it would be an excess of caution to wait indefinitely for the yet undiscovered inscriptions which are credited with power to speak the last word.

I may be allowed to throw Waddington's date into terms of two calendars: (1) the 'Epheso-Asiatic' Calendar, under which Polycarp died at Smyrna; (2) the Jewish Calendar, a term of which is undoubtedly embodied in the Acts of his martyrdom.

1. Though the point cannot be developed here, it is certain that the calendar known to the countrymen and contemporaries of Polycarp was, in spite of Lightfoot's attempt to eliminate its lunar character and to assimilate it with the solar methods of Rome, a calendar closely modelled on the Babylonian system. In this it resembled every Eastern calendar known to history, be they called 'Asiatic' or 'Epheso-Asiatic,' or 'Macedonian' or 'Syro-Macedonian,' or 'Jewish' or 'Rabbinical.'

One feature common to them all has been un-

accountably forgotten by modern students. Every month in Babylonian and derivative reckonings, including the thirteen calendars discovered by Masson in Florence, and known by the name of *ἡμερολόγιον μηνῶν διαφόρων πόλεων*, is allotted *two* 'first days,' the former of which is the *last* day of the preceding month. Through neglect of this elementary principle, Lightfoot assigns 31 days to the 'Asiatic' month Dios, whereas 30 days was the extreme limit ever reached in an Eastern calendar.

I shall now try to exhibit the date determined by Waddington, in terms of a week culled from my reconstruction of the

EPHESO-ASIATIC CALENDAR FOR 155 A.D.

Dysstrus (the 5th Month). (February)—

<i>Dysstrus</i> 23 = Sat.	Feb. 16
„ 24 = Sun.	„ 17
„ 25 = Mon.	„ 18
„ 26 = Tu.	„ 19
„ 27 = Wed.	„ 20

Xanthicus (the 6th Month). (Feb.—Mar.)—

Dysstrus 28 = Th. Feb. 21; serving as *1st first day* to Xanthicus.

Xanthicus 1 = Fri. Feb. 22; serving as *2nd first day* to Xanthicus.

Xanthicus 2 = Sat. Feb. 23; date of martyrdom.

2. Turning now to another all-important datum drawn from the earliest accounts of the death of Polycarp, but overlooked by Dr. Ramsay, we find that the martyr was burnt on 'a great Sabbath.' Here we are brought face to face with a technical term that belongs exclusively to the Jewish Calendar. Its meaning I have tried to illustrate and establish in my *Anglo-Jewish Calendar for Every Day in the Gospels*. In Greek and Latin this hitherto obscure term is best rendered by *σάββατον πρωτόπρωτον* (cf. Lk 6¹), and *Sabbatum primo-primum*. As I have endeavoured to show in the above work, this particular Sabbath recurred pretty frequently, and embraced in itself the double sanctity of the weekly Sabbath and the New Moon Day. Hence it was called 'great' or 'high,' or, to use a phrase of the Latin Liturgy, 'a double of the first

class.' In this connexion Lightfoot hazards a conjecture which has not a shadow of foundation in early Hebrew literature or liturgy, and states that 'a great Sabbath' means 'the Sabbath after Easter.'

I have reconstructed the Jewish Calendar for 3915 A.M. or 155 A.D., but in order to anticipate the obvious suspicion that my figures are 'cooked' to make them square with Waddington, I may be allowed to state that at the outset of the calculations, in which I have been helped by Dr. Halm of the Royal Observatory, Edinburgh, I had not the least notion how my hypothesis touching 'a great Sabbath' would work out in relation to the received date of the martyrdom.

I now append an excerpt form :

THE JEWISH CALENDAR FOR 155 A.D. (a Jewish Leap Year).

Adar (the 12th sacred Month). (February)—

Adar 24=Sat. Feb. 16.

„ 25=Sun. „ 17.

Adar 26=Mon. „ 18.

„ 27=Tu. „ 19.

„ 28=Wed. „ 20.

„ 29=Th. „ 21.

Veadar (Intercalary). (February)—

Adar 30=Fri. Feb. 22; serving as 1st first day to Veadar.

Veadar 1=Sat. Feb. 23; „ „ 2nd first day „ „

This last is at once the weekly Sabbath and the beginning of a new month, or a New Moon Day in the Jewish Calendar. On such a day Polycarp died. It also tallies exactly with Xanthicus 2nd in the first table. (On Veadar=Xanthicus, see Fotheringham, *Journal of Philology*, vol. xxix. p. 110). All the conditions of the problem seem to be fulfilled in the equation—

Xanthicus 2nd=Veadar 1st='a great Sabbath'=Saturday, Feb. 23, 155 A.D.

No such verification is possible for 166 A.D. Therefore Waddington's year 155 A.D. and not the other is the date of the death of S. Polycarp, martyr.

Contributions and Comments.

The Phrase, 'The Virgin-Birth of Our Lord.'

A PHRASE has lately appeared in current English theological literature, which seems to be accepted (it is employed, at least) by men of all parties, by High and Low Churchmen, by Broad Churchmen, and especially by the followers of the higher criticism, to whatever Church or denomination they belong. It may be well, therefore, before the term gets definitely established in English theology, to examine it somewhat closely, and to ask what it means, especially as used by the advocates of the higher criticism.

Taking the term 'Virgin-birth' by itself, it may perhaps be understood to mean that our Lord was born of a pure virgin, unsullied by act of man; but the more precise signification would seem to be that before, during, and after parturition the blessed Mary remained a virgin. Physiologically, I suppose, this would be called extra-uterine pregnancy and parturition, if there be such a thing. This belief is held as the only orthodox belief in the Greek and Roman Churches. But it is not

held by the majority of those who are now using the term 'Virgin-birth'; nor is it incumbent on all English Churchmen, still less on other Churches or bodies, English or foreign. A man may fervently believe in the literal truth of the Gospels, may accept all the statements of the whole of the New Testament, and yet deny that any such assertion as this latter belief is to be found there.

The majority of those who use the term now, especially the higher critics, do not employ the term in this sense at all; they use it to imply the miraculous conception of our Lord by the Holy Ghost in the womb of the Virgin Mary, that which is termed in more technically theological language the Incarnation; it is in this sense they use the term 'Virgin-birth.' Are birth and conception the same thing? Did our Lord's Incarnation commence at His birth? 'When Thou tookest upon Thee to deliver man, Thou didst not abhor the Virgin's womb' (cf. Lk 1^{44, 45}). The Apostles' Creed makes two distinct statements: 'Who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary.' By the writers above alluded to the term 'Virgin-birth' is used to cover both these

statements, but the stress is laid, in the meaning and employment of it, especially on the former clause, 'conceived by the Holy Ghost.'

Is this a fitting use of language; to employ the same term to denote two separate acts of different character, the evidence required to establish which is of a wholly distinct kind? The conception of our Lord as recorded by St. Matthew and St. Luke is clearly intended to be the record of a miraculous event; the writers have the full consciousness of the stupendous character of the miracle which they relate. The birth of our Lord, taken by itself, is nowhere said to be miraculous. It was the result of a miraculous conception, but the pregnancy followed its natural course (Lk 1^{41,55}). There were the natural signs of it (Mt 1¹⁸). The birth came at the normal time (Lk 2^{5,6}).

Not only are these two events so different in character, but the evidence required for the proof of each is of a quite distinct kind. From the nature of the case, if it took place at all, the only human witness and evidence of the miraculous conception can be that of the blessed Virgin alone; all other knowledge of it must have come from her, or have been præter-human. The blessed Virgin feared to speak of it herself (Mt 1¹⁹). She went to the only human being who then might understand and sympathize with her case. But the testimony and corroboration of Elisabeth (Lk 1⁴¹), like the dream of Joseph (Mt 1^{20,21}), are recorded as plainly præter-human. Whatever human evidence of the circumstances of the conception is recorded, must have come mediately or immediately from the blessed Virgin herself. She is the only possible purely human witness. By what steps, through what media, her evidence reached St. Luke, we do not know. It is he only who mentions 'Mary, the mother of Jesus,' after the Ascension (Ac 1¹⁴); but, however he received the narrative, if the conception by the Holy Ghost is a fact, if it really happened, she can have been the sole human witness and source of evidence.

How different is the case with regard to the birth. There is nothing in the narrative to show it to have been different from any other human birth; it could be witnessed to by the same evidence as any other human birth. The treatment of the babe is the same. None of the miraculous events which followed precludes this. The apparition of the angels, the visits of the shepherds, and of the Magi, do not point

to anything præter-human in the birth itself. St. Matthew and St. Luke (Mt 2¹, Lk 2¹⁻⁵) register it, and account for the place and circumstances by the political events of the time. Yet these two events, the conception and the birth, depending on such different kinds of evidence, are classed together under the one term, 'the Virgin-birth,' by those who profess to examine the Gospels critically and scientifically.

In this matter Christian art may well put these critics and scientists to shame. Take Murillo's painting of the Immaculate Conception, with its atmosphere of miracle and wonder, and its solitary human form, and write under it 'The Virgin-birth.' Can anything be more absurd? Contrast with this any picture of the Nativity, with its human figures, and atmosphere of human family life, and how avoid seeing the difference between the two? If those who use the term 'Virgin-birth' believe that the blessed Virgin before, during, and after parturition remained a virgin, according to the teaching of the Roman and Greek Churches, let them employ it in this sense; but let them not include in it the conception by the Holy Ghost, what is termed by theologians the Incarnation. If they do not believe the former, and yet continue to include both the miraculous conception of our Lord and His human birth under one common term, we submit that this is a misuse of language, and shows a lack of discrimination between different kinds of evidence, which must shake confidence in their criticism of the narratives of the New Testament. When half Europe is preparing to celebrate the jubilee of the Immaculate Conception, it can hardly be that they abstain from the use of the second word through prudery.

WENTWORTH WEBSTER.

Basses Pyrénées.

The Unjust Steward.

It has been a difficulty to many that such a character as the unjust steward should find a place in one of our Lord's parables. We may, indeed, expect that as Christ kept company with sinners, as He came to this world for the purpose of saving them, so they will find a large place in His parables. But this man is not only unjust in reputation when he is first introduced, but straightway does a thing which seems to be fraud and yet wins the com-

commendation of his lord. Moreover, it is for the sake of the lessons contained in such an action that our Lord speaks the parable. What was this act, and was it fraud?

Dr. Margaret Gibson, in the April number of *THE EXPOSITORY TIMES*, suggested that the difficulty of the parable lay in our interpreting it according to Western ideas of stewardship. When a proprietor engages a factor, or steward, he pays him a fixed salary or a fixed percentage of the rental. The proprietor himself reserves the right to go into all the details of his business, and generally he must be informed of the character of every tenant and the amount of the rent the tenant pays. It is the proprietor himself who grants a lease and determines the rent and the amount of money to be spent on alterations and improvements on the property. Everything is done in accordance with our Western ideas of careful and accurate business.

In the parables of our Lord, where the relations between master and servant are introduced, it is manifest that they are different from the corresponding relations among ourselves. The existence of slavery made a difference, and that not always of a harsh kind. A faithful and trusted slave might often have a discretion and a liberty in dealing with his master's affairs greater even than the liberty Western masters entrust to their devoted servants. The steward was sometimes a freed man, sometimes a slave, and generally would occupy his position because his master thought him trustworthy. Once into the position of steward apparently he had the power to fix the rents the tenants were to pay without referring the matter to his master at all; he had the power to fix the value of his own services, a very dangerous temptation alike to Eastern and Western temperament, and whatever corresponded to Western 'expenses of management' he could fix too. His master committed everything to him, he was to make what he could of the whole business and hand over what he could to the master without giving him trouble.

The Eastern reluctance to be troubled probably explains the whole system, and this is another characteristic our Lord introduces once and again into His parables. This unjust steward apparently had succumbed to indolence and voluptuousness, the result being that he had to grind as much as possible out of the tenants, and he paid as little as possible to the lord. The steward system might work well enough where there was a servant or a slave who had

never lost the sense of what was due to the master, but it was, and is, a system beset with innumerable temptations to a weak and covetous mind.

The complaint against the steward indicates what must have been common, only probably the real complaint of the tenants usually was that the steward was defrauding *them*. Just as probable it is that if they had gone to the master with this complaint they would have been dismissed. That was none of the master's business; he left that to his steward. They wanted to strike at the steward, and the only way they could get the master to interfere was by saying that the steward was defrauding *him*. And our Lord introduces this character to us at this crisis in his affairs, when the tenants and the lord both turned against him because of his tyranny and injustice. A man whose sin has been found out, and who now is face to face with the consequences of unfaithfulness and vice. He admits to himself, as he thinks of his desperate condition, that he is helpless, but he decides upon a certain action, and straightway puts it into execution. He calls the tenants before him, and he asks the first how much he owes. On being told a hundred measures of oil, he says, 'Take thy bond and sit down quickly and write fifty.' Apparently this fifty was paid over by the steward to the master and the steward himself kept nothing. Similarly with the tenant who owed a hundred measures of wheat and paid only eighty. The amount owing in both cases may have been augmented by the steward's fixing of an exorbitant rent, but, in any case, what seems to have happened in the action, on account of which the parable is spoken, is that the steward does a generous thing to the tenants, a just thing to the master, a thing which is a complete sacrifice to himself. He might have done quite otherwise. He might have resolved that as he was to be put out of the stewardship he would make every penny he could while he still was steward, but he did the very opposite. The result of his action is that foes are changed into friends. Tenants could not but feel that, however unjust and tyrannical he had been, this was a kind thing he had done to them. He had tried to do what he could at the last. His master also commended him for exhibiting a trait in his character which seemed to be utterly wanting. And the steward now, though his past has been bad, has by this action of his changed foes into friends and altered his desperate circumstances.

Jesus teaches a double lesson by this action of the steward.

1. *There is a lesson of wisdom.* Here is a man reduced to desperate circumstances changing foes into friends by thoughtfulness and worldly wisdom. Our Lord indicates the motive in the man's heart to get food and lodging after he was deprived of the stewardship. Similarly also the prodigal thinks; because he is starving and could get food at his father's home. Jesus seems to say to men, 'even for reasons such as these consider how to live.' Does godlessness truly profit? Is it worth while living a worldly or a wicked life? Weigh the matter in the low scale of profit and loss, exercise common sense in eternal things. If a man in desperate circumstances by thought and by calculation can change his condition, why may not you?

2. *There is a lesson in the character of the action.* After thought has been stimulated all depends upon what it leads to. In this man's case it led to a self-sacrifice. In the act there is manifest an admission of past injustice. As Zacchæus restored fourfold to any he had defrauded, this steward restores what he can to the tenants he has robbed. He hands over to the master just what he gets from the tenants, depriving himself of everything—in this last transaction apparently not keeping even that to which he was entitled in his attempt to remedy the past. Jesus tells us that an action such as that, an admission such as that, on the part of a poor bankrupt soul silences accusations and brings down the mercy and the pity of God. When a soul gets into desperation on account of its sin, when it has to confess the past is past and sin is sin, it still is possible by change of heart, by repentance, the very essence of which is self-sacrifice, to receive the mercy and forgiveness of God. This creature in the parable divested himself of everything and threw himself with all his unjust past on the pity of those he dealt with. Is not the lesson this, that when a human soul does that with God it receives His mercy and His salvation?

W. D. MILLER.

Dunipace.

Rabbinical Illustrations of the Epistle of St. James.

THE Epistle of James is especially addressed to Jewish readers (Ja 1¹). It is not surprising, therefore, that it contains elements which are found also

in rabbinical tradition. Such tradition in its written form is long subsequent to the Christian era, yet it is beyond question that its substance is derived from the Babylonian schools which continued the rabbinical teachings of the classical age which preceded the Fall of Jerusalem far more truly than the written tradition of Hellenistic Judaism which fell under Greek influence. A few instances selected from the eastern (Chaldaic) line of tradition, illustrating passages in the Epistle of James, are given below.

1. Ja 1¹⁷ 'Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above.'—Explaining the fall of fire and brimstone on Sodom, R. Ḥanina refers to this, evidently proverbial, saying, 'that only good things come from above.' R. Ḥanina said, 'The Holy One, blessed be He, does not send down any evil thing from above, only that the rain became brimstone' (Tanhuma), א"ר ר' חנינא בן פוי אין תקב ה' מוריד מלמעלה דבר רע אלא מטר ונעשה נפריה.

This appears again in Beresh. Rabba as 'R. Ḥanina said that no evil thing comes from above,' א"ר חנינא אין דבר רע יורד מלמעלה.

2. Ja 2³.—Relative treatment of rich and poor in the 'synagogue,' either as house of prayer or house of judgment. Connecting Dt 1¹⁷ and the words 'a sword cometh on the people' (*Pirke Aboth*) B'nei Joseph on Dt 1¹⁷ says, 'Ye shall not respect persons in judgment; when there come a rich man and a poor man to the Beth Din do not say to the rich man "sit on the seat," whilst thou dost not lift up thine eyes on the poor man to look in his face, for then is thy judgment not a righteous judgment, and for this perverted judgment it is said a sword cometh upon the people,' לא תמירו פנים במשפט, כשיבוא עשיר ועני לדין אל האמר לעשיר שב על הכסא ואל העני גם לא תרים עיניך להביט בפניו או משפט לא משפט צדק ולזה יקרא עוות הדין וחורב באה לעולם.

3. Ja 5¹⁷.—For the tradition that the drought in the days of Ahab lasted three and a half years, as against 1 K 18, 'R. Berachiah and R. Kalbo in the name of R. Jocanan said, Three months before and three months after, and twelve in the middle made eighteen months, and because they were days of suffering he called them many days' (Jalkut Simeon), רב ברכיה ור' חלבו בשם רבי יוחנן ג' חדשים בראשונה וג' חדשים באחרתה וי"ב באמצע הרי י"ח חדשים ובי ימים רבים היו אצא ימים של צער לפינך הוא קורא אותן רבים. This explains 'in the third year' (1 K 18¹), as three months in one year, a whole

year, and three months in the third; evidently these preceding and following periods of three months appear again in the slightly different tradition of Ja 5¹⁷ and Lk 4²⁵.

4. Ja 5¹⁷.—Elijah's prayer as a type of successful prayer. 'And Elijah the Tishbite said there should not be dew or rain.' R. Berachiah said R. Josa and the Rabbonin dispute about this; one said that God accepted his prayer concerning the rain but not concerning the dew, and the other that he was heard both concerning the rain and the dew (Jalk. Sim. on 1 K 17). ויאמר אליהו החסבי אם יהיה טל ומטר רבי ברכיה אמר רבי יוסא ורבנן חד אמר על המטר נשמע לן על הטל לא נשמע לו וחד אמר על הטל ועל המטר ושמע לו.

The writer of Kings speaks of no prayer, but of a message from God. DE LACY O'LEARY.

Bristol.

Coverdale on the Apocrypha.

W. H. DAUBNEY closes his little book on *The Use of the Apocrypha in the Christian Church* (London, 1900): 'The more it (the Apocrypha) is used with devoutness and candour, in the spirit which our Church points out and in her formularies exemplifies, the more, I think, shall we be disposed (even if we do not go so far as Whitgift) to agree with those words of Miles Coverdale, Bishop of Exeter, which I have already cited, "that *patience and study will show that the Apocrypha and the Canon are agreed.*"'

He quoted these words on p. 62, where he writes: 'When Miles Coverdale placed all the Apocrypha (except Baruch) at the end of the New Testament, he expressly stated that he did not wish it to be despised or little set by, and that patience and study would show that the Apocrypha and the Canon were agreed (Smith's *Dictionary Bib.* iii. 1671a).'

Where did Coverdale use the latter words? The former ('not . . . that I would have them despised, or little set by') are to be found *verbatim* in his Preface of 1535 (reprinted in the *Variorum Apocrypha*), and the rest of this Preface gives expression to the conviction that Canon and Apocrypha are agreed; but the words quoted by Daubney are not to be found in it. Was Daubney mistaken, or where else are they to be found? [I beg to note that Smith's *Dictionary* is not at my

disposal.] But there is another passage in this preface to which I would call attention. Coverdale writes: 'As for the *prayer of Solomon* (which thou findest not herein), the prayer of Azarias, and the sweet song that he and his two fellows sung in the fire: the first (namely, the prayer of Solomon) readest thou in the eighth chapter of the Third Book of the Kings, so that it appeareth not to be Apocryphum; the other prayer and song (namely, of the three children) have I not found among any of the interpreters, but only in the old Latin text, which reported it to be of Theodotion's translation. Nevertheless . . . I have not left them out.'

The first part of this remark hints at an edition of the Latin Bible used by Coverdale, in which the Prayer of Solomon was attached to the prayer which closes the Book of Ecclesiasticus as in the Codex Amiatinus, or in the *capitula* published by J. M. Caro, 1688, and republished by Sabatier, 1751—

cxxvi. Oratio Jesu filii Sirach;

cxxvii. Oratio Salomonis; or,

De confessione et laudatione eiusdem filii Sirach,

De oratione Salomonis ad dedicationem templi Dei.

Thielmann (*Bericht*, etc., in *Sitzungsberichte* of Munich, 1899, ii. 2, p. 216) mentions ten MSS. containing this appendix. It would be interesting to learn in which of the printed editions it is found. It stands in some at least of the pre-Lutheran German Bibles; for instance, in Hain 3131.

EB. NESTLE.

Maulbronn.

The Carob and the Locust.

I.

In discussing the question of the food of John the Baptist (Mt 3⁴) Professor Henslow makes this remark, 'No one, so far as I know, has ever suggested the simple substitution or transposition of a letter.' If I mistake not, the learned writer proposes to correct חנב (חנבא) 'locust,' into חרב (חרבא) 'carob pod,' in the assumed Hebrew or Aramaic original of Mt 3. The suggestion has already been made, on the supposition of its originality, in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*, col. 2136 (art. 'Husks').

T. K. CHEYNE.

Oxford.

II.

Professor Henslow's communication (p. 285 ff.) reminds me that some sixteen or seventeen years ago one of my parishioners, a Major R.E., told me that soon after our occupation of Cyprus he had been in charge of a gang of native road-makers there. One day there was some excitement, owing to a workman having found some rock-honey in excavating (cf. Dt 32¹⁸). He found the men eating it *with carob beans*. In spite of the commentators (who nearly all think of the insect as the Baptist's food), I have felt ever since that it was the bean, and rock-honey. The wilderness of Judea is rocky, and the locust insect surely does not appear every year, so as to be a regular, not an occasional, food.

Moreover, does it settle (in quantities) in the wilderness? Would it not be found on cultivated land? Is it supposed that the Baptist bought a sack of the salted insects? The narrative implies the coarsest wild product. GEORGE FARMER.

Hartlip Vicarage, Sittingbourne.

Did Jonathan taste Hachish?

THERE would seem to be some rather important objections to the idea of hachish being suggested instead of honey (in 1 S 14; see THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, January, p. 149; February, p. 239) in order to interpret the words, 'his eyes were enlightened.'

In the first place, Saul had said, 'Cursed be the man that eateth any food until it be evening.' Hachish is *not* food, nor could anyone understand it as such, any more than opium.

There is no evidence of *Cannabis judica* having been grown in Palestine in ancient times. Moreover, as I learn from a great authority on Eastern matters at the British Museum, to consume hachish in any form—either smoking or as a decoction in water—was quite foreign to the Semitic character. Then again, to secrete the resinous matter, a hot climate is needed. In the Kew Museum there are plenty of specimens from various hot regions, but none from Palestine, though Dr. Post says, in his *Flora of Syria*, etc., that plant is now grown plentifully for the fibre; but he makes no mention of hachish. If it were produced it would be doubtless forbidden, as it is in Egypt to-day. Consequently, like the date, which will not ripen in Palestine, so the resin is probably not produced there.

But supposing it were, it does not 'drip' like honey; and has to be taken off the plant by somewhat violent measures.

Lastly, so far from hachish opening or enlightening the eyes, *immediately*, as recorded of Jonathan; it has precisely the opposite effect. The first result is the feeling of a dead weight on the eyelids, as if some one were pulling them down; then follows a profound sleep.

There would seem to be a much swifter and more natural interpretation of the passage. Jonathan knew nothing of Saul's curse; but the moment he tasted the honey, he would see the alarmed expression on the faces of those standing around. That would be quite enough to indicate that he had done something he ought not. Consequently, 'Then answered one of the people,' etc. and explained the unfortunate circumstance to him.

GEORGE HENSLOW.

London.

The Transfiguration.

IN recent comments and notes on the Transfiguration in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, I have been surprised that no reference has been made to the fact that in each of the Synoptics the narrative follows immediately on the prediction, 'there be some standing here,' etc. The words, 'and after six days,' *i.e.* six days from the prediction, it seems clear to me, record the Transfiguration as the fulfilment of the prediction.

St. Matthew has: 'till they see the Son of man coming in His kingdom.' St. Mark: 'till they have seen the kingdom of God come with power.' St. Luke: 'till they have seen the kingdom of God.'

I cannot find any other so exact fulfilment of the prediction as in this wonderfully vivid representation, foreshowing the coming of the kingdom of God with power. There is the splendour of the glorified Redeemer, whose redeeming death, not yet accomplished, is *spoken of* between Him and the representatives of the past economies of the kingdom; and there are the three apostles as representing the subjects of the kingdom.

It seems to me that this explanation makes the fact of the Transfiguration to be full of inspiring teaching.

When you consider how welcome and how very rare are distinct chronological indices, enabling us to construct a gospel narrative in exact order, the triple index above cannot be disregarded.

G. STRINGER ROWE.

Headingley College.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, St. Cyrus, Montrose.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

A NEW theological quarterly journal has appeared in America under the title of *The Baptist Review and Expositor*. It is edited by the Faculty of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary.

Right in the middle of the first number lies an article by the President of that Faculty, Dr. E. Y. Mullins. It discusses a matter of considerable urgency at the present moment. For since Professor William James of Harvard charmed us all by the dash and generosity of his Gifford lectures, the question has been waiting discussion, Who is it or what is it that starts in us that experience which is called Conversion? Professor James, we know, accepts Conversion as a fact, and seeks to set it on a scientific basis. Who or what is the author of it? What happens to us when we are converted, and who is it or what is it that causes that to happen?

Dr. Mullins recalls three books which handle the question. One is *The Evidence of Christian Experience*, by the late Professor Stearns of Bangor. Another is *Christian Life and Theology*, by Professor Foster of Michigan. The third is the Gifford lectures which have been mentioned—*The Varieties of Religious Experience*, by Professor James. These three books agree in recognizing the fact of Christian experience—that singular experience which is denoted by the convenient

word Conversion. They differ in their estimate of the author of it.

Professor Stearns held that the author of Conversion (let the word have its full and proper meaning) is Christ. Professor Foster holds that it is the person's own choice of duty. Professor James holds that it is the soul's entrance upon communion with the Oversoul, that is to say, with the spiritual universe of which this world is a part, or, if you prefer the phrase, with the Higher Powers. Professor James is an agnostic; not a full-blooded boisterous agnostic like the late Professor Huxley or the late Sir Leslie Stephen, but what Dr. Mullins calls a 'semi-Christian agnostic'; and so it does not become him to define his 'Oversoul,' 'Spiritual universe,' or 'Higher Powers' more narrowly. He does not care to call it God, because he does not think it need be infinite. Nor does he like to call it god, because he is not sure that it must be plural. It does not greatly matter. This is enough for the present, that this communion with the Higher Powers is a wholly new and radical change in a man, well deserving of the name Conversion and all the meaning that can be contained in that name.

The three writers agree that Conversion is a change that is radical, far-reaching, and nearly always permanent. They also agree that in some

proper sense it is supernatural. Professor Stearns does so clearly when he calls its author Christ. So does Professor James when he refers its origin to the Oversoul, Spiritual Universe, or Higher Powers. And so also does Professor Foster, though he speaks of it as the ultimate choice of Duty. For he says distinctly that no man would ever choose Duty if he did not come in contact with a certain supernatural Person who urges its choice upon him. Indeed, he defines Duty as love to God as Father. And he says that no man would ever love God as Father if he did not see God in the face of Jesus Christ.

Very well. Professor Stearns, Professor Foster, and Professor James agree that Conversion is a fact, and that it is a supernatural fact. Who is the author of that fact? They differ there. Professor Stearns and Professor Foster agree that it cannot come to pass without Christ; Professor James believes that it can. Professor Foster differs from Professor Stearns in holding that Conversion is the acceptance of the law of Duty (which is the law of love to God) because it has been shown by Christ to be worth accepting: Professor Stearns believes that Conversion is the acceptance of Christ Himself.

How shall we decide between them? Dr. Mullins is convinced that there is only one way. It is the way recommended by Professor James—and sometimes followed by him. *Observe the facts of Christian experience.*

Now when the facts of Christian experience are observed, this is the result. Preaching with a certain element in it has always produced conversion. Preaching without that element has always failed. Is that element the insistence on Duty, even when Duty is defined as the Love of God? It is not. Is it the demand for communion with the Oversoul, the Spiritual Universe, the Higher Powers? It is not. In his recent history of early Christian Missions, Harnack says that in the early Church conversion was wrought

by the preaching of the personal Christ. What Harnack says of the earliest conversions, Dr. Mullins says is true of every conversion that the world has ever seen.

Was Luther insane? The question forms the title of an article in the *Dublin Review* for the month of April in the year of our Lord 1904. The writer of the article is Miss J. M. Stone.

Miss Stone's article is a free review of a book by the Rev. Heinrich Denifle, O.P., which was published in Mainz last year under the title of *Luther und Lutherthum in der ersten Entwicklung*. Miss Stone has a high opinion of the Rev. Heinrich Denifle's work. It is 'an important work', it is 'a valuable and competent work'; it is 'in many ways a luminous contribution to the modern school of Reformation criticism.' She thinks the time for such a book has come. 'Our better understanding of the Reformation period enables us to sift evidence more carefully, and thereby to arrive at more indulgent conclusions.' It is now possible, she believes, to make a more judicial revision of Luther's life and temperament than ever was made before.

The Rev. Heinrich Denifle has made this judicial revision. He has arrived at these more indulgent conclusions. It is true that he comes to the conclusion that Luther was addicted to habitual drunkenness. It is true that in his judicial revision of Luther's life he decides that 'his intercourse with the band of runaway nuns, one of whom he afterwards married, was distinctly immoral.' Still, the Rev. Heinrich Denifle is a great historian, and he has come at the right time.

Well, was Luther insane? It is difficult at first to say. It is evident to Miss Stone that he was a great liar, and that he was not ashamed of it. 'What would it matter, asked Luther, if one were to tell a good round lie for the sake of a higher motive and in order to further the interests of

the Christian Church'? But that is not conclusive evidence of insanity. It only raises the question whether his imagination was possibly diseased from the beginning—a problem, says Miss Stone, 'which seems to us to merit and demand the consideration of the modern historian.'

It is evident, again, that Luther's moral life was very bad. Miss Stone does not believe that he was a habitual drunkard. She does not even believe that his intercourse with the band of runaway nuns was distinctly immoral. But she agrees with the Rev. Heinrich Denifle that 'the very kernel of Luther's theology is his own guilty and miserable moral condition'; and she reproves 'Harnack and all other Protestants' for not seeing that. But even a guilty and miserable moral condition does not prove a man insane. It only makes the problem of diseased imagination more acute and pressing.

Now there are some signs that are very suspicious. 'While no epithets were too grossly offensive for his enemies, he never lost his temper with his friends.' That is one sign. Here is another. 'As the father of a family his urbanity inclined to the maudlin.' Again, his spirits were sometimes 'extravagantly high, and he knew how to introduce a jovial tone among his guests at table.'

He had visions too, and Father Grisar, another indulgent historian, of whom Miss Stone has a higher opinion than even of the Rev. Heinrich Denifle, 'Father Grisar arrives warily at the conclusion that the most suspicious of Luther's visions are those which were supposed to have a consoling, edifying, and encouraging character.' So Miss Stone returns to her question, 'Are such things, taken together, compatible with sanity?' And, almost as if she were an *ad hoc* Scotchman, she answers by another question, 'May not the true inwardness of the case lie in the term *mental aberration*?'

We have not hitherto found much edification in

the titles of the Psalms. We have not even found much instruction. For the most part we know not what they mean. There they are, but the key to their meaning was lost long ago. 'The LXX,' says Delitzsch, 'found them already in existence, and did not understand them; they cannot be explained even with the aid of the Books of Chronicles, in which much is said about music; the key to their comprehension must have been lost very early.'

But now Mr. Frowde has published a volume, *The Titles of the Psalms, their Nature and Meaning* explained by James William Thirtle (6s. net). Mr. Thirtle claims that the long lost key has been found.

It seems to be a genuine discovery. And, like all great discoveries, it is extremely simple. Mr. Thirtle has discovered that the musical titles have been placed at the beginning of certain psalms, whereas they belong to the end of the previous psalm.

It was the study, not of any of the psalms in the Psalter, but of the Psalm of Habakkuk, that led Mr. Thirtle to his discovery. The Psalm of Habakkuk opens with the words: 'A Prayer of Habakkuk the Prophet upon Shigionoth.' It ends with the words 'To the Chief Singer on my stringed Instruments.' The psalm stands by itself. There could be no confusion with other psalms. Therefore the ending comes at the end. It is not attached to the beginning of another psalm.

Mr. Thirtle went back to the Book of Psalms. He saw at once that the musical titles which are found at the beginning of certain psalms did not suit the character of those psalms. They suited the character of the psalm preceding. His discovery was made. The psalms had once followed one another without a break. When they were detached, the musical endings had been carelessly carried away at the beginning of the psalm that came next.

Take the case of Psalms 55 and 56. At the top of Psalm 56 we read (in the R.V.): 'For the Chief Musician; set to Jonath elem rehokim. A Psalm of David: Michtam: when the Philistines took him in Gath.' The words, 'Jonath elem rehokim' are translated in the margin, 'The silent dove of them that are afar off,' or 'The dove of the distant terebinths.' But there is no reference to a dove in this psalm. It is in Psalm 55 that we read, 'Oh that I had wings like a dove! Then would I fly away, and be at rest.' Mr. Thirtle shows that the literary information about Psalm 56—that it is a psalm of David, that it is in character that special kind of song called Michtam, and that it refers to his experience in Gath—belongs properly to the psalm it is prefixed to. But the musical information, that it has been handed over to the care of the Chief Musician in the temple, and that it goes among the musicians by the title of its most distinctive verse—the Dove of the Distant Terebinths—that belongs to Psalm 55.

Now the puzzle of Psalm 88 is resolved. We read: 'A Song, a Psalm of the sons of Korah; for the Chief Musician; set to Mahalath Leannoth. Maschil of Heman the Ezrahite.' How can one and the same psalm be a Song of the sons of Korah and Maschil of Heman the Ezrahite? Delitzsch tries to discover 'which notice is the more trustworthy.' Transfer the words, 'A Song, a Psalm of the sons of Korah,' to the previous psalm. That psalm is already so described in its heading. At the end of it the description is repeated. There is no contradiction. Mr. Thirtle claims that now each psalm has its own title, and the character of the psalm agrees with it.

There has been a good deal of superficial writing about the Abbé Loisy since his dramatic condemnation by the Vatican, and some of it has been frothy as well as superficial. In a sermon preached at St. Mary's, Oxford, and reported in the *Guardian* of 9th March, the Rev. W. R. Inge, Fellow of Hertford College, gets at the heart of

the matter. It is not a dispute between a French ecclesiastic and his superiors. It is an incident in a movement of the most vital consequence for the Christian faith.

In the history of the conflict between Science and Religion there has not been written a more curious chapter than the condemnation of the Abbé Loisy. For whatever heresy Father Loisy has been supposed to be guilty of, his only real heresy is attachment to the Catholic Church. He is impressed with the progress of science. He is sensitive to the conflict between science and the faith. The whole desire of his heart is to put the faith of the Church on a footing of independence, so that henceforth no conflict between Science and the Faith can ever arise.

The pressure of the conflict between science and religion is felt by Abbé Loisy in the criticism of the Gospels. There the miracles, and especially the miracle of the Virgin-birth, must be dealt with. Modern science rejects the miracles of the Gospels; it refuses to believe in 'an isolated case of parthenogenesis.' What is the Church to do? Abbé Loisy, in his French atmosphere, sees no hope for the Church in the conflict with Science. Is there no way of escape from the conflict, from all such conflicts forever? He finds a way in the separation of the faith of the Church from the person of Jesus of Nazareth.

He does not deny the existence of Jesus of Nazareth. He would say that the existence of Jesus of Nazareth was essential to the faith of the Catholic Church. The Catholic Church developed out of Jesus of Nazareth. But in its development it has long since left the Jesus of the Gospels behind. Like St. Paul it has said, 'Though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we him no more.' Why then should the Church care whether the miracles are accepted or rejected? Why should it seek to identify its faith with the contents of the Gospels? The religion of Jesus has developed into the religion of

the Church. 'The Church,' he says, 'in order to be identical with the religion of Jesus, need no more reproduce the exact forms of the Galilæan gospel than a man of fifty need resemble a newly born child. When we want to assure ourselves of the identity of an individual we do not try to squeeze him into his cradle.'

What is the objection to this? Mr. Inge finds several objections. His first objection is that for some of its so-called 'developments' the Church was indebted to the pressure of popular demand, not to the voice of the Spirit. 'A more spiritual presentation of truth,' he says quietly, 'might have won a more durable if less rapid success.' His next objection is that the Roman Church is not all the Church of Christ. If the Roman branch developed in one way, and other branches in other ways, with which did the true development go? 'If the development of Roman dogma and culture was inevitable, so was the reaction—the Reformation—which it provoked.' His last and chief objection is that the continued existence of a Church is no proof of true development. Its present 'faith' may be due to a series of adaptations which were forced upon it in its struggle to exist. True development must be shown to be in moral and spiritual descent from the life and teaching of its Founder. 'External continuity,' says Mr. Inge, 'is not disputed, and proves nothing.'

There is a defence of Abbé Loisy in English by the Rev. T. A. Lacey, which Lord Halifax has commended in an introductory letter. The wonder is, not that he is defended, but that, by ecclesiastical authority, he has ever been condemned. Perhaps ecclesiastical authority does not admit the conflict, or does not feel it so keenly as the Abbé Loisy does. If it did, where could a better argument for the Church be found? How could it be placed on a more unassailable foundation? Father Loisy thinks that Jésus was a person of 'limited intelligence,' who went about telling men to prepare for a Messianic apocalypse, which he

wrongly believed to be near at hand. 'But, consider,' says Lord Halifax, 'how carefully he has distinguished between matter of faith and matter of science. He has impugned no doctrine of the Church; he professes unhesitating assent to all defined truth.'

'Unhesitating assent,' exclaims Mr. Inge, 'to the full divinity of this person of limited intelligence, this victim of Jewish patriotic dreams! Unhesitating assent to the miraculous Birth, Resurrection, and Ascension of this Being, as defined by the Church!' Scientific criticism takes the miracles away; let them go, says the Abbé Loisy. The Church receives them all; take them back again, he adds. Criticism takes them away by the use of the understanding; the Church restores them by the exercise of faith.

This is the heart of the matter. This is where Abbé Loisy has significance for us all. In the interests of science he denies us the exercise of our intellect. In the interests of the Church he destroys the foundation of our faith. Because Science and the Church are at war, Christ is sawn asunder. 'There is a sharp distinction,' he says, 'between Jesus of Nazareth and the Lord Christ.' And his Anglican advocate, though not so pointedly, says, 'the Christ of our altars is surely the historic Christ, not a thin figure drawn from inadequate materials in the Synoptics.'

Mr. Inge perceives the drift of this apology. The historic Christ, who is so much better than the thin figure drawn from the Synoptics, is the Church. It is the Gnostic Æon Ecclesia invested with divine attributes. It is here, and not in the Gospels that we are invited to study the character and life of our Redeemer. St. Paul, who is often invoked by the Loisy school of apologists, made it his hope and aim that the Church might grow up *into* Him in all things, which is the Head, even Christ. We are now told that we must be content to grow up *out of* Him. We are forbidden to look back for Christ. We are equally forbidden to look up for

Him. We are told to find Him in the Church—and 'there rises before our imagination a figure splendid but terrible, with the light of contemplation and the fire of devoted enthusiasm in her eye,

but splashed with innocent blood, like the rider of the Apocalypse, even to the horse-bridle, the cruel oppressor of liberty, the bigoted enemy of truth.'

Mr. Tennant's Theory of the Origin of Sin.

BY THE REV. W. MACKINTOSH MACKAY, B.D., ABERDEEN.

THE promise Mr. Tennant made two years ago, in his fresh and interesting lectures on the 'Origin and Propagation of Sin,'¹ he has just fulfilled in the larger work on the Fall-story in pre-Christian or rather pre-Augustinian thought;² and the result is that we now have his theory in a complete form. In the earlier and perhaps more interesting work, Mr. Tennant was content to deal with the doctrine of Original Sin in the light of philosophy and modern science—specially the latter. He threw out the idea, however, that the doctrine, as we have it to-day, was not the outcome of a true exegesis of Scripture, but was due to 'speculation, working indeed on the lines of Scripture, but chiefly moulded by the current science and philosophy of the times.' This statement he has now tried to prove by an examination of the Fall-story, not only as it appears in the Bible, but also in all extra-canonical Jewish and early Christian literature. To say that this is done with scholarship, lucidity, and above all with fairness to the facts before him, is only to say what all previous readers of Mr. Tennant's work would expect. The book covers pretty much the same ground as Dr. Clemen's *Christian Doctrine of Sin*, but the standpoint is quite independent, and in its examination of Jewish extra-canonical writers is much fuller. On the latter subject it is, we think, a real contribution to theological science.

Nevertheless, in one point it is distinctly inferior to the German work. It lacks the severely impartial attitude of that writer. Mr. Tennant writes with a distinct bias in his mind against the whole conception of 'a Fall'; and this polemic,

though it does not interfere with his candour in giving us the facts, does very materially interfere with the scientific impartiality of the conclusions he draws from these facts.

Thus in his opening chapter on the meaning of the Fall-story, Mr. Tennant accepts what one can only call the extravagant and very slenderly supported view of Wellhausen, that the story in Gn 3 is a mere culture-myth; that there is no moral content whatever in the eating of the forbidden fruit; that the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil is symbolic of the advance of science, and that the reason of God's anger at Adam and Eve for eating of it was not because of their disobedience, but from a jealous fear that Adam would now become the 'lord of nature and able to use its forces for his own purposes.' As Clemen well remarks, had this been the idea in the author's mind, he would not have made the woman lead the way.³ It is contrary to the whole Oriental conception of woman that she should lead the van in the progress of knowledge. But, indeed, the whole trend of the narrative is opposed to such a view. That ethical considerations are paramount with the sacred writer is evident from the story of the crime of Cain, which immediately follows; while the origin of science forms a special section still farther on. The only reasonable ground for the interpretation of Wellhausen is the curious anthropomorphism at the close of the chapter (Gn 3²²): 'Behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil: and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever: therefore the Lord God sent him forth,' etc.; but this verse is now almost universally regarded as forming no part of the original narrative, which knows nothing about any pos-

¹ *The Origin and Propagation of Sin*. Hulsean Lectures. By F. R. Tennant, M.A., B.Sc. Cambridge University Press, 1902.

² *The Fall and Original Sin*. By F. R. Tennant. Cambridge University Press, 1903.

³ *Die Christliche Lehre von der Sünde*, p. 154, Theil I. Von Dr. Carl Clemen. Göttingen, 1897.

sibility of escaping the doom of disobedience, namely, instant death.¹

So, too, in regard to the religious value of the Fall-story, Mr. Tennant gives an appreciation which we venture to think very few will accept. His judgment is that it is neither an allegory nor a myth, but a 'history.' It is a very peculiar history however; for its only importance lies 'not in what it tells about its subjects but its authors.' That is to say, the only value of the Fall-story is the light it throws on the religious development of those who wrote it, and as Mr. Tennant places it very late in Jewish history, this is not very great. We might point out in passing that this estimate is hardly consistent with the author's acceptance of Wellhausen's exegesis of the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil to mean the Tree of Science, which is surely allegory; but it is more important to remind Mr. Tennant that not only Dr. Hort, whom he quotes, but the best modern thought is entirely at variance with him in this estimate.² Whatever view we take of Gn 3, we cannot get over the fact that there is some element of symbolism there. The very name, 'Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil,' is a sufficient evidence of that.

Even in what must be regarded the fairest part of the book, that on Jewish extra-canonical writers, the same bias may be traced. The author, with his usual candour, gives the uninitiated reader the materials for forming his own judgment here, and certainly the impression left with us, from reading these, is that the early Jewish writers often come marvellously near the Christian doctrine of an 'original taint' due to a primal act of sin; though they may not be very clear as to how the two are to be related together. This is specially true of Ben Sirach, whose words, 'From the woman was the beginning of sin, and through her we all die,' can have only one meaning. Mr. Tennant, as it seems to us, signally fails in trying to minimize their importance.

On the whole, the impression got from a perusal of these Jewish writings, so fully and, we must add, so skilfully brought before us by Mr. Tennant, is that of the extraordinary interest the story of the

Fall of man seemed to have in the last phase of Jewish national literature. That interest often expresses itself in fantastic forms, but it is always there; and in some, such as *Esdras*, the problem is grasped with insight and power. We may willingly agree with Mr. Tennant that Augustine was indebted to these either directly or indirectly, without at all accepting the deductions he makes from such indebtedness.

The interest of 'the Apocrypha' in the Fall-story is some compensation for what is, after all, one's chief perplexity in regard to it, namely, the comparative silence of the Old Testament on it, and may also suggest the explanation of that silence, that the tradition was not committed to writing when the majority of the Bible authors lived. At the same time the silence of One, who must have known it well and read it often, suggests another still more feasible view. Christ, it has often been remarked, says nothing about the Fall-story, and the omission has sometimes been interpreted to its disadvantage.³ But the reason is surely different. It is the same as that of the comparative silence of the Old Testament. It did not fall in with their purview. Neither Christ nor the Old Testament prophets and psalmists were dogmatic theologians. They dealt with sin as a fact, not as a doctrine. At the same time, whatever view our Lord took of the value of the details of the Fall-story (and these we think are of little importance), there can be no doubt that His conception of sin is one which is in fullest accord with the *doctrine underlying the Fall-story*. It is a conception of sin which roots it deep in 'the heart' of man; which sees in him a 'lost son of God,' with the image of His Maker deeply imprinted there, though sadly defaced; and which, if we accept the Johannine supplement to the synoptic teaching, holds that man is so incurably tainted by sin that nothing less than a 'second birth' can put him right again.

This is the real 'source' of the Christian doctrine of sin, not the 'Fall-story' as we have it in Gn 3; and this is our chief criticism of Mr. Tennant's book, that in his examination of Scripture and Rabbinical writers he makes far too much of the mere details of the story, or how it is to be related to man's sin, and does not see that these writers are really wrestling with two great facts of faith and experience; the universality and radical nature of

³ See *Origin of Sin*, p. 150.

¹ So Gn 2¹⁷ 'In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die'—obviously a moral or spiritual death, as neither Adam nor Eve died *physically* on the day of disobedience.

² See Bernard's articles on 'The Fall' and 'Sin' in Hastings' *Bible Dictionary*.

sin and the holiness of God as man's Creator. It is out of that great antinomy that the Fall-story emerged at the first, and it is in the light of it that the Bible and Jewish literature must be studied.

The same criticism must be made on the chapter on Paul. Our author makes a great deal there, like Ritschl¹ before him, on the difficulty of interpreting Ro 5¹², 'By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all sinned,' and deduces from that difficulty the conclusion 'that in all probability none of the several forms of the doctrine was ever distinctly present to the apostle's mind.' Here surely the great question is not as to what form the doctrine took in Paul's mind. The great point to be noted is that *he had a doctrine of it*. How the sin of the first sinner was transmitted to the race might not be very clear to him. Personally we incline to accept Bengel's exegesis that he means to say we were all seminally present in Adam and sinned in him. We think this likely to one brought up in Rabbinical modes of thinking; though we do not believe that such a view is therefore binding on the Church, or indeed that he would have wished to bind the Church to such a view. But that is not the great point. The great thing to be emphasized here is, that *to Paul a doctrine of Original Sin was a necessity of Christian thought*. It was a deduction from what to him were the two primary axioms of faith and experience, the holiness of God, and the universal and inborn character of sin.

This brings us to look at Mr. Tennant's own theory as it is outlined in the first of the works we have referred to—the Hulsean Lectures on the Origin of Sin. In these lectures the author approaches the subject, less as a theologian or philosopher than as a Christian man of science. Not that he does not deal with original sin from both these standpoints; but his chief difficulty (as it doubtless is with us all) is to harmonize the Christian doctrine of sin with the account science gives of human origins. The doctrine of original sin may be summed up in the Preacher's statement: 'God made man upright, but he has sought out many inventions.' Mr. Tennant, however, does not believe that man was originally 'upright' in any other than a physical sense. He fully accepts the Darwinian view that man originally was an anthropoid ape, moved only by the appetites of

hunger and lust, and rose by slow degrees, through promiscuity, polyandry, totemism, and so forth, up to the time when by tribal influence a rude conscience and ruder religion were evolved. Yet along with this he claims that his faith in Christianity is not in the least imperilled, nay, rather, is placed thereby on a more stable foundation.

It is the purpose of these lectures to vindicate this position; but—while we can only sympathize with the attempt to harmonize the Christian faith with the most advanced conclusions of Darwinian science—we do not think that the success of the result has been very great. Of course it must be premised that Mr. Tennant's view of Evolution is very different from that of the ordinary Christian evolutionist. According to the latter, only the physical structure of man was developed. When that was prepared, God 'breathed into man and he became a living soul,' innocent though not morally full-grown. In other words, primitive man was like Wordsworth's child, a being—

Trailing clouds of glory . . .
From God who is our home.

Such a beautiful dream Mr. Tennant cannot believe. He would say with the late Professor Drummond, 'God does not dwell in gaps.' There is no gap from the ape up to Abraham, perhaps up to Christ.

Whence, then, is the origin of sin in such a creature? Its origin, he says, takes place in the conflict which inevitably emerges between the lower nature, or the original brute, and the higher reason or spirit, which the Divine Creator slowly breathes into the ascending nature of man. God is immanent in man from the first, but His presence only gradually makes itself felt by a higher nature or reason in the ape. At first this has no civilizing result. It may rather increase his ferocity and jealousy. But though primeval man in this condition must have been a creature of savage appetites and furious passions, Mr. Tennant does not think his creation casts any discredit on His Creator, simply because as a child he did not know any better. He had no sin, because he was not conscious of any sin. 'By the law,' says Mr. Tennant, 'is the knowledge of sin,' quoting here Paul with approval. By and by, however, as the Divine Spirit gradually worked in man, a rude tribal law or conscience was evolved. Now came the conflict between the lower nature and the

¹ *Justification and Reconciliation*, English trans., p. 345.

higher law in man. At the first man was bound to yield to the lower; because the higher nature had not sufficient power to resist. But as time went on, the higher nature grew sufficiently strong to overcome the lower, and it was then that sin arose. It took place—man fell, if we may use such a term—when, knowing the higher law, he yielded to the lower. ‘Sin,’ says Mr. Tennant, quoting Archdeacon Wilson,—‘sin is only an anachronism.’ It is yielding to the lower at a time when the man should have been able to obey the higher.

But why, it may be asked, does man sin still as readily as in early days? If humanity has been progressing all those æons of years, surely by this time the spirit would have conquered the flesh? What is the explanation of the universality and apparently inborn character of sin still to-day? Mr. Tennant’s answer to this is, that the ape-like nature of man being there at the first, has, so to speak, *a handicap over the spirit in the race of life*. He quotes with approval again, the words of Paul, ‘First that which is natural, then that which is spiritual,’ and says that in every child the story of primeval man is practically told over again. The divine spark begins only as a spark in an overwhelming mass of fleshly appetites; so that defeat is inevitable there from the first. Gradually, however, as by training and growing intelligence the child awakes to the ‘law of the spirit,’ it attains its ascendancy over the flesh and rises into the liberty of the children of God. At first this ‘defeat’ of the spirit by the flesh is natural and cannot be called sin. But as the child learns to know better, as its lower nature becomes ‘moralized,’ such compliance is of the nature of ‘sin.’ It is, however, ‘a product of the ordinary course of nature, and cannot be called original sin.’¹ Thus not only a state of original righteousness and a Fall, but the whole conception of Original Sin is denied by Mr. Tennant. ‘The Fall’ is only coming to a knowledge of sin, and this is no true Fall, but rather a decided rise.

So far Mr. Tennant. It is curious that while freely acknowledging his debts to others, he does not see the likeness of his theory to Schleiermacher’s view of the origin of sin—namely, that it arose in the conflict between the Self-consciousness, or the Flesh, and the God-consciousness, or the Spirit, in man. That great thinker found his ex-

planation of the universality of sin in the fact that man was originally an animal into which the Divine Spirit was breathed. He was thus unequally handicapped from the first, and the lost ground could only be gained by the union of flesh-weighted humanity with the perfect humanity of Christ.

The great objection the Christian consciousness must make to it, as it must still more to Mr. Tennant’s form of it, is that it practically makes God the author of sin. Sin is ‘natural’—inevitable from the first. The man-ape, the creature of monstrous lusts, is God’s last and highest work. Mr. Tennant tries to evade this difficulty by saying that man did not then ‘know any better,’ and that may be granted, for sake of argument, though on other grounds we might well question his position and point to facts which show that God’s law was written in man’s heart as soon as he knew that he was a man. But the point here for Mr. Tennant is, if man did not know better, surely *God knew better and could do better*. Let any one picture this primitive man of modern anthropologists—‘hateful and hating’—a ferocious monster of hunger, lust, and jealousy, and ask himself whether the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ can be conceived as making a being like that; still less delighting in it as the crown of creation. Certainly that was not Christ’s view. When He looked out at a wrecked humanity, He did not say, ‘This is natural. This is inevitable. This is man in the making.’ He said, ‘An enemy hath done this.’

Mr. Tennant quotes Paul’s statement, ‘By the law is the knowledge of sin’ approvingly, but what his own theory really amounts to is, ‘By the knowledge of law is sin.’ Sin begins when man becomes conscious of it. But this is not Paul’s view. Sin is sin, whether we know it or not. It depends on God’s eternal law. Our guilt may depend on our knowledge, but not our sin. Sin itself is as absolute as God. Sin is the eternal antinomy of God.

Further, Mr. Tennant dwells on the danger of binding Christian truth to an unscientific theory of man’s origin. Has he any sufficient grounds for calling the conception of primitive innocence unscientific? Many anthropologists to-day of the highest class hold such a view as at least possible. They point to the early pure faiths of India, Egypt, and Greece as proofs of the view that retrogression

¹ Hulsean Lectures, p. 114.

from innocence may go side by side with progression from ignorance.

And while science may be admitted to have proved that man is inconceivably older than our fathers dreamed, the striking fact that four thousand years ago the Semite had found God, while the Fetish-worshipper of to-day is as far from him as ever, would seem to prove that more than mere development is needed to explain the history of the human race. There is a striking confirmation of that in the account Mr. Tennant gives in his second volume of 'Fall-stories' in other religions. He is candid enough to confess that the Bible story cannot be derived from any of these, though he thinks it will yet be. That may be, but if so, it will be found that in the derivation it has been infinitely purified and elevated. Certainly, as compared with the fantastic and often filthy mythologies collected by Mr. Tennant, it stands out, not as a 'parallel,' but rather as a noble contrast.

Professor Bruce used to tell his students he found no proof of the inspiration of the true Gospels so satisfying as a perusal of the apocryphal ones. To a less extent perhaps, but as fairly, one might say that nothing will commend the Bible Fall-story more than a perusal of Mr. Tennant's 'parallels.' Even if, as he says, its only value were as a history of its authors, it would not be without value as suggesting the question: 'Whence hath this people these noble thoughts?'

It may be admitted that the doctrine of Original Sin is, as Pascal said, in some of its aspects 'an incomprehensible mystery.' It may be further admitted that, as it came from the hands of Augustine, it was far from perfect. To our thinking we are indebted to modern science for placing the doctrine on its true basis. That doctrine, as

we believe the Bible as a whole would teach it, is not one of imputed guilt. Original sin is not a crime of Adam, for which his posterity are held responsible. It is a hereditary taint which entered humanity at its dawn in some mysterious way, which we can never perhaps fully understand, save that reason and faith alike demand that it could not have been by the will of the Creator. This is the Christian doctrine of Original Sin. It may be described as a *hereditary soul-sickness*.¹ Biological science teaches us what a mighty principle heredity is in the building up of the physical structure of life. Medical science adds further the contribution that heredity is of vast importance as a means of the transmission of moral qualities from father to son. Surely it is in the line with all these teachings, when we believe that a disease so deep as sin, a disease which changes man's whole relations to God and his fellow-men, should participate in the same law of inheritance.

Mr. Tennant tries to minimize hereditary sin, but in this we think he is untrue to that very science of which he professes to be the exponent, and for our part, while mysteries remain, we venture to believe that the explanation which the Bible gives is the truest to the facts of life—facts which make us agree with the profoundest of our modern poets,² when he said of our Christian faith—

I still to believe it true
See reasons and reasons—this to begin
'Tis the faith that launched point-blank her dart
At the head of a lie, taught *Original Sin*
The corruption of man's heart.

¹ So Bernard, article 'Fall,' in Hastings' *Bible Dictionary*. It was also practically the view of Zwingli and Melancthon.

² Browning, 'Gold Hair; a Story of Pornic.'

Recent Literature on the Religions of Greece and Rome.

WHAT is the meaning of the recent rush of books on the Religions of Greece and Rome? If it is the operation of the law of supply and demand, which even books and authors bow to, the question is not answered. What has raised the demand? Is it the new conception of what Religion is? With that there has certainly come a new joy in the

study of it. For since it is no longer necessary to think of God as requiring every prayer to be translated into Hebrew until Christ came; since it is possible to believe that the prayers of even the Egyptians who were drowned in the Red Sea entered into the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth, new life has flowed into the study of the Egyptian Book

of the Dead. There is the joy of science also. For there is no science where there is no order; and there is no order where there is not a God of order. The Religions of Greece and Rome are literally in some phases 'a worship of devils,' but even the worship of devils takes its place in a movement which may be ascent or descent, but which has its causes and consequences, and is watched over by the only living and true God.

The most recent book on the Religion of Greece or of Rome is Miss Harrison's *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*.¹ It is also the book to begin with, in a survey like this. It sets one right at once with the progress of this study; and there is a prophetic vitality about it which not only excites keen interest in the moment of reading, but opens up avenues of eager hope for future research. The immediate impression made by the book is that this is the study in which one's life ought assuredly to be spent.

In the way of scientific progress what a stride it records from our schoolboy lessons on the Olympian gods. As in so many other branches of knowledge, the world has grown millenniums older within the last few years. Homer and the Olympians are now quite modern. Their manners are in accordance with the latest requirements of the world of fashion. Once in a way (as we see them in the new light) they betray an earlier origin, even an earthly one, by the persistence of some curious chthonic ceremony, or even by the unexpected use of some outlandish word. But they are civilized gods. They have taken on culture and the arts of etiquette. They have almost entirely forgotten the hole of the pit whence they were digged.

Miss Harrison begins long before the days of Olympus. She follows the gods away back to their earth-born and under-world originals. She has no respect for dignities. Even the great god Zeus must either cut himself off from half his altars, or else admit that in the early days 'upon his belly did he go and dust did he eat,' being one of the numerous snake deities. On the whole, the study of the Religion of Greece shows that the

Olympian Zeus has appropriated to himself a great number of altars and offerings which did not originally belong to him.

And, when these altars and offerings are separated from Zeus, a whole world of gods, goddesses, and godlings, a whole world of rites and ceremonies, earthly and unearthly, but not at all heavenly, spreads itself before us. For here also it seems to be true, as far back as evidence carries us, that not that is first which is heavenly but that which is earthly, and afterward that which is heavenly. The process is expressed in one sentence: 'To mark the transition from rites of compulsion to rites of supplication and consequent thanksgiving is to read the whole religious history of primitive man.' In the rites of compulsion the gods are still malignant, in the rites of supplication they are merciful and kind.

But the Olympian divinities are not all merciful and kind. The progress of sublimation was not always direct towards heavenly things. To Miss Harrison the highest reach of Greek religion is found in the Orphic mysteries, and there the earthly and the heavenly are inextricably blended. The Olympus of Homer was more an advance in culture than in religion. If the Olympian Zeus does not descend to the Thracian beastliness and blood-thirstiness of Dionysos, neither does he ever bring the inspiration, the sudden illumination, the large human charity and understanding which come with the moment of initiation.

The revolution in the study of the Religion of Greece, for it is nothing short of a revolution, has been wrought by the monuments. It is, no doubt, a good many years since Schliemann laid bare the Troy which Homer sang. It has taken all these years for the explorers and the classical scholars to come together. Indeed, Professor Ridgeway claims that his *Early Age of Greece*² is the very first attempt that has been made to bring the archaeological and the literary evidence together and test the one by the other. Professor Ridgeway has, at any rate, the right to claim that he is the first classical scholar who has worked the subject from the side of the monuments. His results are quite revolutionary.

¹ *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*. By Jane Ellen Harrison, Hon. D.Litt. (Durham), Hon. LL.D. (Aberdeen), Fellow and Lecturer of Newnham College, Cambridge. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1903. 8vo, 15s. net.

² *The Early Age of Greece*. By William Ridgeway, M.A., Disney Professor of Archaeology in the University of Cambridge. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1901. Vol. i. 8vo, 21s.

The discoveries belong to what is called the Mycenæan Age in Greek history. And the question is, Who were the heroes of the Mycenæan Age? Whose is the civilization which has been laid bare by the pick and the spade at Mycenæ, Tiryns, Hissarlik, and elsewhere? When Professor Ridgeway began to write he could say, 'Scholars are practically unanimous in regarding the civilization of the Mycenæan age as the product of that Achæan race whose deathless glories are enshrined in the Iliad and the Odyssey.' But there is no such unanimity now. For Professor Ridgeway has used the monuments and interpreted the literature by their aid, and he has come to the conclusion that the Mycenæan artists were not Achæans but Pelasgians. And he has persuaded a great many of the classical scholars that he is right. The revolution is understood when it is remembered that some time ago it was not considered safe for a man who believed in the existence of the Pelasgians to mix freely with his neighbours.

The evidence largely belongs to Religion. For it is man's relation to his God that begins earliest and lasts longest. The greater number of the remains have been found in tombs, and they were placed there for religious purposes. And the evidence deeply affects our knowledge of Religion. If Professor Ridgeway had not brought archæology and literature together, Miss Harrison could not have written her *Prolegomena*. The Homeric religion has been shown to be more modern than the Mycenæan. It has been shown to be more aristocratic. It has been shown, in short, that Homer does not describe the religion of Greece in any age, but only the Religion of a select few of the cultured people of Greece in an age that was already far advanced in syncretism and self-esteem.

The classical work on the classical Religion of Greece is Farnell's *Cults of the Greek States*.¹ Miss Harrison's book is prolegomena; Professor Ridgeway's is pioneer. Dr. Farnell has no discoveries to startle the world with, he has no red-handed revolutionary instincts. He describes the worship of the great Greek gods and goddesses from the earliest historical times to the latest, and throughout

the whole Greek world. He is very careful to distinguish between what is native and what is foreign, and to show what the Greeks did for any worship that was introduced among them. He leaves the worship to explain the god, but then he makes so scientific a selection of the statues and has them engraved so artistically that the most striking feature of his book is its presentation of the way in which the Greeks of historical times conceived their deities to live and love in the likeness of mortal men.

Dr. Farnell is too good a scholar to rush after every novelty. But he is also too independent a thinker to have no novelties of his own. He shows, for example, that there was a goddess called Nemesis, who was a real personality to the pious Greek, and quite distinct from the abstract idea of Retribution. It is in this line of things—in his exposition of the Greek ideas of Fate, Fortune, Retribution, and the like—that Dr. Farnell seems to be most original and to have rendered most service to the study of the Religion of Greece. For it is here that our modern monotheistic minds find most difficulty in getting alongside the Greek way of thinking. Even in the days of the great tragedians there was no sharp line of division between vengeance and the avenger. Personality was not yet clearly marked off from what was impersonal. And so it is not at all correct to speak of abstract qualities like Justice, Destiny, Fidelity as personified by the Greeks. Justice, Destiny, and Fidelity were both gods and virtues, and the virtues and the gods were distinct. Deification was a political device of the Roman emperors; personification was never practised or conceived by Roman or by Greek.

While all the rest are revelling in the results of exploration, Professor Lewis Campbell deliberately turns his back upon the shovel and gives his whole mind to the pen. He calls his book *Religion in Greek Literature*.²

That the progress of the Science of Religion demanded a new working of the religion to be found in Greek Literature there can be no question. The question is whether such a working is possible, or at least productive of much good, if the literature is not checked and interpreted by the monuments. Dr. Campbell's methods look old-

¹ *The Cults of the Greek States*. By Lewis Richard Farnell, M.A., Litt.D., Fellow and Tutor of Exeter College, Oxford. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press; 1896. Vols. i. and ii. 8vo, 32s. net.

² *Religion in Greek Literature*. A Sketch in Outline. By Lewis Campbell, M.A., LL.D. Longmans, 1898. 8vo.

fashioned, his results are foreseen, his book is somewhat dry.

The volume is History. It is History with a capital letter. There are no surprises, there is no offence. All that popular religion which the poets ignored and the philosophers frowned upon, is kept out of sight. The religion of Homer was never the religion of Greece, but it is the religion Dr. Campbell chooses to describe for us. There is much dignity in the theme, some grandeur also (though not always moral grandeur), and the style of the historian agrees with the respectability of the theme.

And yet it has insight. Professor Campbell is too good a classic not to see and separate the essential things from the accidental. 'What is essential in Homer,' he says in one place, 'is not always that which has left the most lasting impression on mankind. The beauty of Helen, of the "face which launched a thousand ships," has passed into the "world's desire"; but the remorse of Helen, her misery, and feeling of her own condition, on which the poet lays at least equal stress, have been little noticed. The meeting of Paris in the field with the man whom he has wronged, which "cows his better part of man," has also a profound significance. It is indeed within the human sphere that the *divine* in Homer is to be found.'

Professor Jevons has edited a volume which has been published anonymously under the title of *The Makers of Hellas*.¹ Anonymous books rarely succeed. This is one of the most searching and helpful volumes dealing with Religion which we have seen, yet it will have a fierce battle to fight before it wins its way. The name, and still more the excellent work, of Professor Jevons will do something for it. But even in that there is disadvantage. A book with an Introduction by another is supposed to need all the recommendation it can get.

The plan of the book is original. The author's interest is in Religion. The Makers of Greece are its religious thinkers, whether poet or philosopher, whether unknown or well known. But no thinker stands alone. He owes half of his thinking to his

¹ *The Makers of Hellas*. A Critical Inquiry into the Philosophy and Religion of Ancient Greece. By E. E. G. With an Introduction, Notes, and Conclusion by Frank Byron Jevons, M.A., Litt.D. Griffin, 1903. 8vo, 10s. 6d. net.

environment. Accordingly, before Religion is introduced, there are three long chapters on the Land, the Language, and the People. These chapters are skilfully written, and in accord with the latest knowledge. Then the great writers are introduced. Each is himself, yet he is of his age, his country, his language. His religious ideas are the ideas of mankind at a certain stage of culture, a certain range of hope and faith. These ideas are described separately. Under 'Æschylus,' for example, there is a discussion of his ideas of God, Sin, the Great Unwritten Laws, and the like. It is all sound work and highly instructive. The book deserves recognition, hearty and widespread.

In his *Myths of Greece*,² Mr. George St. Clair challenges the whole tendency of modern Greek scholarship. He challenges every attempt that has ever been popular, almost every attempt that has ever been made, to explain the Mythology of Greece and Rome. He offers an explanation of his own.

The oldest way of regarding the myths is to take them literally. But Mr. St. Clair does not believe that Œdipus killed his father and married his mother; he does not believe that Antigone was built into a wall to perish; he does not believe that Dirce was tied by the hair to a bull and dragged to death.

Next came Euhemerus and the philosophers with their human explanation of all the divinity and the mystery in the myths. Zeus was a king of Crete, who had been a great warrior in his day, and whose exploits had got much magnified, and he himself deified by subsequent admirers. Mr. St. Clair does not believe in Euhemerism, though Herbert Spencer did.

Then the phenomena of the natural world were called upon to furnish an explanation. Orpheus is the wind sighing through the forest; the clouds, as they hurry past, are poetically conceived as the cattle of Apollo, which Hermes the fleet has stolen. Mr. Fiske, in 1870, described this theory as 'now victorious along the whole line.' It is the theory of the dictionaries to this day.

But the etymologists have driven it hard. Max Müller looked upon mythology 'as an affection

² *Myths of Greece Explained and Dated*. An Embalmed History from Uranus to Perseus, including the Eleusinian Mysteries and the Olympic Games. By George St. Clair. Williams & Norgate, 1901. 2 vols. 8vo.

or disorder of language.' 'Language,' said Sir George Cox, 'is the only trustworthy basis for the science of Comparative Mythology.' Linked to the poetical treatment of natural things, it was beautiful and plausible. We see the lovely evening twilight die out before the coming night, and prosaically speak of it so; the Greeks said that Eurydice had been stung by the serpent of darkness, and Orpheus was gone to fetch her back from the land of the dead. But the etymologists and all the heavenly music which they made are out of court to-day. Max Müller lived long enough to see the myths of the Dawn perish before the satirical pen of Mr. Andrew Lang.

Mr. Andrew Lang is a folklorist, and nearly all the scholarship of to-day has bowed down before the latest application of the theory of evolution. Etymology has given place to anthropology. The Greek myths describe what the Greeks of the time in which they arose believed and lived. There are savage tribes to-day who think and worship in the language of the most incredible mythology. But Mr. St. Clair believes no more in Andrew Lang than in Max Müller.

He holds that the mythology of Greece and Rome was built upon Astronomy and the Calendar. The signs of the zodiac are in it. Taurus is the bull that swam across the sea with Europa; Capricornus the goat fought with Jupiter against the Titans. The stars are in it and all the planets. The great bear is Callisto, who was changed into a she-bear by Zeus. The Pleiades were the daughters of Atlas and Pleione, and were seven in number; but we see only six, because one of them, whose name was Sterope, hides her face for shame. So the voyage of the Argonauts was an astronomical quest, 'as we must surely recognize as soon as we learn that the golden fleece which they sought belonged to the ram of the zodiac.'

Will Mr. St. Clair win? Lang and Tylor and Frazer are doughty combatants. But we saw Max Müller all victorious once.

With Macmillan's 'Handbooks of Archaeology and Antiquities' one is mostly safe. With Mr. Warde Fowler one is in the hands of the foremost English expositor of the religion of Rome. The book has a modest title. The *Roman Festivals* it is called.¹ But round the festivals Mr. Warde

Fowler has gathered a very full and illuminating account of the religion of the Roman republic.

If one were beginning the study of Comparative Religion one could not begin with a better book than this. Every sentence is exact in statement, all is built on the most recent literary and monumental knowledge, and all is touched with an interest that constantly suggests the nearness of divinity, and yet is delightfully human. The volume may not give us a complete account of the religion of Rome, but we take the whole volume with us, and what we learn we shall not have to unlearn.

In the time of so many reversals of human judgment it is no surprise to find Plutarch exalted and extolled and made very high. Dr. Oakesmith has a little grudge against Christianity, not for refusing Plutarch his own exactly, but rather apparently for setting up its own brilliant light to the loss of his weaker luminary. He does not believe that Plutarch ever treated Christianity badly. He does not think he ever knew anything about it. Whether it would have been better for him if he had, Dr. Oakesmith seems to doubt. He scarcely could have been wiser or more moderate. He who did so well by an outworn creed might have lost himself if the knowledge of a new vigorous and glorious creed had been made known to him.

But in this it is hard to follow Dr. Oakesmith. Not only because Christianity uplifts always and perplexes never; but also because Plutarch's creed, on Dr. Oakesmith's showing, is often just a little less than Christian. Dr. Oakesmith makes him out to be one of those who were not far from the Kingdom. And it is clear to every reader of the book that it would have been an incalculable gain to Plutarch if he had entered it. The title is *The Religion of Plutarch*.²

Professor Hardie's lectures³ are not wholly religious. The religious lectures are the second

the Study of the Religion of the Romans. By W. Warde Fowler, M.A. Macmillan, 1899. Crown 8vo, 6s.

² *The Religion of Plutarch*. A Pagan Creed of Apostolic Times. An Essay. By John Oakesmith, D.Litt., M.A. Longmans, 1902. Crown 8vo, 5s. net.

³ *Lectures on Classical Subjects*. By W. R. Hardie, M.A., Professor of Humanity in the University of Edinburgh. Macmillan, 1903. Crown 8vo, 7s. net.

¹ *Handbooks of Archaeology and Antiquities: The Roman Festivals of the Period of the Republic*. An Introduction to

and third—'The Beliefs of the Greeks and Romans concerning a Life after Death,' and 'The Supernatural in Ancient Poetry and Story.' Nor is the religious interest even in these very keen. Professor Hardie is a literary rather than a religious critic. Extremely pleasant to read is his volume throughout, and that is all that Professor Hardie sets out to do for us. Besides the two essays named there is another which comes close up to the religious sentiment, and contains perhaps the deepest thinking in the book. It is the essay on 'The Feeling for Nature.' Mr. Hardie sees and shows that, to the Greek, Nature rather more than 'half revealed the Soul within.'

Now end with two useful schoolbooks, both handling the Mythology rather than the Religion.

Mr. Berens¹ describes the myths separately and simply. No aetiology is obtruded. There are some useful little woodcuts scattered throughout the text.

Two American writers have published a cheap and unbound volume in 'The Students' Series of Latin Classics,' on Greek and Roman mythology.² The little volume is based on Steuding, and is written with considerable grace. One useful feature is the quotation of the most important passages in the classics which describe the gods and goddesses and heroes.

¹ *The Myths and Legends of Ancient Greece and Rome.* By E. M. Berens. Blackie. 2s. 6d.

² *Greek and Roman Mythology.* By K. P. Harrington and H. C. Tolman. Amer. School and College Text-Book Agency.

Christ's 'Yea.'

BY THE LATE REV. W. A. GRAY, ELGIN.

'But in Him was yea.'—2 Cor. i. 19.

ST. PAUL is here vindicating himself from a charge of inconstancy. He had promised a visit to Corinth, but had changed his mind. And he feared lest his enemies might avail themselves of the fact to lower his character and depreciate his apostolic authority. 'He is a trifler,' they might say. 'He is a trimmer.' 'He is a shuffler.' 'He is a man who does not know his own mind, saying Yea in one breath, Nay in another.' 'Impossible,' says St. Paul, 'impossible that fickleness like that should account for my change of plan. In doing as I did, I took my orders from Christ, following the leading He afforded, the path He revealed. And with Him there is no instability, with Him there is no double-mindedness, with Him there is no hesitation. He knows neither variableness nor shadow of turning.' With men, in the execution of their own plans and the achievements of their own ends, it may often be 'yea, nay'—'yea' first, and 'nay' afterwards. But in Him, that is Christ, through all His actions and through all His dealings it is absolute, uniform, and perspicuous, 'yea.'

'In Him is yea,'—the phrase finds an echo in modern literature. In that powerful and suggestive book in which Carlyle depicts the history of a human soul, there is a chapter of peculiar impres-

siveness which he terms the 'Everlasting yea.' In that chapter he brings the life he delineates through the stages of negation and doubt to the secret and centre of ultimate certainty and of ultimate calm. What was that secret? What was that centre? In what, after searching, did he reach and lay hold of the 'Everlasting yea'? In contempt of pleasure, in annihilation of self, in submission to circumstances, and in earnest, strenuous, and useful work. True so far as it goes! Stimulating so far as it goes! I believe the teaching of Carlyle at this point has awakened not a few who have read it to a deeper conception of duty, a higher ideal of life. But the fault of Carlyle's message lies in this, that he places the ground of the certainty and calm inside a man himself, his views and his efforts; whereas that certainty and that calm find their basis outside of man—on an external foundation, in an external source. For perfect certainty and for perfect calm we need a something or a some one beyond us as our standard, our security, our rule. And He whom we need is revealed to us, He whom we need is commended. It is Christ. Get hold of Christ, and along with Christ, you get hold of what? All that enables you to brave life, all that enables you to face death,—the reconcilia-

tion of human contradictions,—the solution of human problems, and the foundation of human peace. Elsewhere we have 'nay,' the nay of negation, or at best but 'yea-nay,'—the yea-nay of doubt, hesitation, inconsistency, or change. In Christ, and in Christ alone, we have simple, steadfast, and immutable 'yea.'

I.

Now we shall take the thought widely. And in taking it widely, we begin by reminding you that, in order to be 'yea' to us, Christ in the first place was 'yea' to God. What I mean is, that with Him is the 'yea' of *mediatorial compliance*. We take Him in relation to the law and will of God. And we say that in Him was the 'yea' of redeeming obedience—absolute, perfect, and sincere. And where but in Him do we find it,—this yea of compliance, this yea of obedience?

Not in the world. The attitude of the world to the law and the will of God is a 'nay,'—bold; uncompromising, defiant,—'Nay, but there is no God.' Or, if God be granted, it is 'nay' still. 'Nay, but we desire not the knowledge of thy ways.' 'Nay, but our lips and our lives are our own, who is Lord over us?' 'Nay, but it is vain to serve God.' 'Nay, but we shall not surely die.' The characteristic attitude of the world to the law and the will of God is an attitude of negation. It is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. Through all its threefold manifestation, the lust of the eye, the lust of the flesh, the pride of life, it sounds its plain and emphatic 'nay.'

And as we do not hear a 'yea' in the world, neither do we hear a 'yea,' or, at anyrate, a complete 'yea,' among the saints. In them there is nothing more than a 'yea' and 'nay,' the new man and the old, grace and nature, the willing spirit and the weak flesh. We have imperfections in the most perfect, immaturities in the most mature, failures in the most faithful and reliable. The best and the most we can say of any saint in relation to the law and will of God, is that the 'yea' waxes stronger, and the 'nay' waxes feebler as the days or the years pass on. To the end, the dubiety remains. No mere man since the Fall is able perfectly to keep the commandments of God.

But turn from the world with its 'nay'; turn from the saints with their 'yea-nay,' to Him of whom the text speaks, even Jesus, the Author and Finisher of our faith. And in Him is 'yea' and

nothing but 'yea'—the 'yea' of perfect obedience the 'yea' of perfect consent. And stage after stage, as the Father's plan was unfolded and the Father's will was announced, we find that 'yea' going up from Him, out of the inmost places of His soul. 'Behold a body have I prepared for thee.' 'Yea, and a body will I assume.' 'Behold a message will I give thee.' 'Yea, and a message will I spread abroad.' 'Behold a business will I lay on thee.' 'Yea, and I will ever be about it,—I will glorify Thee on the earth, I will finish the work Thou hast given me to do.' 'Behold a cup will I mix for thee,—a baptism will I appoint for thee, a cup of agony, and a baptism of blood.' 'Yea, I will accept them; how am I straitened till they be accomplished.' So in Him was 'yea,'—the 'yea' of mediatorial obedience. And it was uttered, not only to show us what perfect obedience is like (ah me, if that were all, the sight might move us to despair—so little could we compass it, so little could we rise to it), no, but to atone for our own non-compliance, substituting for our graceless 'I will not,' Christ's glorious 'I will'; for our rebellious 'nay,' Christ's free 'yea'; thus revealing a divine obedience, which, when received by faith, makes the disobedient sinner just.

II.

Let us pass to another thought. In Christ is the 'yea' not only of mediatorial and substitutory obedience, but the 'yea' of *divine assurance*. We look at Him, not merely in His relation to the law and the will of God, but also in relation to the questionings and problems of man. And we say that in Him there is the 'yea' of divine affirmation. Take two illustrations in passing.

(1) Take the beneficence of God. Where but in Christ have you any assurance of that? True, creation, to a certain extent, bears witness to its maker's kindness; creation gives testimony to its maker's joy. You go out to the sunshine of spring—health in the veins, hope in the heart. And nature around is strung to your key. You look at its pleasant sights—the banks that are starred with primroses, the hedges that are bursting with leaves. You hear its pleasant sounds—the rapture of the lark as it mounts in blue air, the murmur of the stockdove as it hides in green alcoves, the hum of the fir trees as they bend in the passing breeze. And surrounded by the brightness and music of the whole, you say, 'Well, it is a happy world

after all; of a surety God is love.' So, too, you say, in reference to society, which in its own way also has its tokens of the benevolent heart of God. You are set in a goodly heritage. You are placed in a happy home, with sufficiency in your basket and store, and children clustering round your knee. And as a sense of your comfort is borne in on you you have the selfsame belief to confess—'it is a happy world after all.'

And yet, it is a faith for fine weather. It is a creed for a summier day. When the landslip comes sweeping down from the peaks above, mingling torn meadows, shattered homesteads, and mangled human beings in one common ruin, is it so easy to say that God is love? When sickness stalks forth from its hidden ambush, enters your home, lays its hand on the little one who was the light and the joy of it, and after days and weeks of slow agony, leaves the figure still and cold in its little shroud, is it easy to say that God is love? Yes, to some, creation is bright for the time being, society is congenial and favourable. But to others this world is a dark and a terrible place, heavy with sorrow, and haunted with doubt. Think of the failure of well-meant efforts. Think of the waste of unanswered affection. Think of the sharp cries of pain and bewilderment that continually go up from a sorrow-stricken earth to an impassive and irresponsible sky. And is it so easy to say that God is love?

But we look away unto Jesus. And what we find not in creation, what we find not in society, we find in Him—a disclosure of the boundless beneficence of God. What do we see as we trace that life? Love from the first to the last of it. Love condescending in Christ's incarnation, love restoring in Christ's works of healing, love forgiving in Christ's gifts of pardon. And all on the basis of love atoning in Christ's tale of sufferings—agony and bloody sweat, cross and passion, death and burial. So, then, it is to Christ we have to look for a witness to the love of God. In Him is the explanation. With Him is the key. What says the hymn?

God's thoughts are love, and Jesus is
The loving voice they find.
His love lights up the vast abyss
Of the Eternal mind.

Is God a father? Has life a purpose? Has heaven a being? The answer of Christ is 'yea.'

(2) Or take the resurrection of the dead. Where,

save in Christ, His person and His teaching, have you a certainty for that? Not in self or in nature. The message of self and of nature is at best but a 'yea' and a 'nay.' Our longings and our instincts breathe a timid and a tremulous 'yea.' So, too, do certain signs and presages in creation around. They whisper an expectant 'yea.' 'Yea,' says the snowdrop, as it springs from the bulb. 'Yea,' says the cornstalk, as it shoots from the seed. 'Yea,' says the butterfly, as it bursts from the husk, to soar and to circle like a winged flower among the sunbeams and the scents of the summer air.

But then comes sense, to disturb and to darken all with its dull and bewildered 'nay.' 'Nay,' but it cannot be. 'Nay,' for the grave keeps all. 'Nay,' for dust unto dust and ashes unto ashes is the final wind up of the whole. But we turn to Christ, and in Him is 'yea.' And what a 'yea' it is. 'Verily, verily, I say unto you, that the hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God: and they that hear shall live.' 'And this is the Father's will that hath sent Me, that of all He hath given Me I shall lose nothing, but shall raise it up at the last day.' 'I am the Resurrection and the Life. He that believeth on Me, though he were dead, yet shall he live again; and whosoever liveth and believeth on Me shall never see death.' That is a 'yea,' indeed, reinforcing and certifying all men have hoped or dreamed with the weight of eternal omnipotence and eternal truth. In Christ's great affirmative our timid, tremulous 'yea' becomes loud and triumphant. The 'nay' of gross sense is overborne and beaten down. And faith can sing, 'O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory? The sting of death is sin; the strength of sin is the law. But thanks be to God who giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ.'

So in Christ is the 'yea' of a divine assurance, in relation to the questions and perplexities of man. To whom shall we go but unto Him? Oh the certainty that is in Christ! And, after all, what men crave in religious teaching is certainty—clearness, definiteness, decision. Especially do they crave it as life goes on; and in the lessening area of time, they are alive to the vastness and nearness of eternity, when matters such as these shall be all in all. What will serve us in the view of *that*, is neither pleasant probabilities, nor is it interesting speculation, nor is it clever tournaments of

theological argument; but something direct, imperative, final. And is not this to be found in the teaching of Christ? Is it not there in His matter—so definite, distinct, uncompromising, with the lines of division He lays down between friends and foes, between sin and holiness, between hell and heaven? Is it not there in His very manner,—so calm, so serene, so authoritative,—never arguing, but always declaring, never apologising, but always commanding. Brethren, if the Lord Jesus Christ were a man, this would be the most intolerable presumption. We could not understand it. We could not put up with it. But if Christ be more than mere man, if He be the very Son of the very Father, sent down from the cleft heaven to tell us of the heart of God, then all becomes clear. It is only right. It is only fitting. In Him is 'yea'—the yea of certainty in Himself, the yea of divine assurance to men.

III.

But again, in Christ there is the *yea of willing welcome*. Here we take Christ, not in His relation to the law of God, nor in His relation to the questions of man, but in His relation to the applications of seeking and anxious sinners. And we say that in Him is the yea of a gracious welcome without by-ends and without recall. Without by-ends—that means a sincere welcome. Without recall—that means a lasting welcome.

(1) The 'yea,' in the first place, of a sincere welcome. Are there not welcomes that are insincere? Are there not welcomes that partake of the nature of a 'yea-nay.' There is the 'yea' of the lips combined with the 'nay' of the heart—that is the welcome of hypocrisy. There is the 'yea' of the lips combined with the 'nay' of the manner—that is the greeting of churlishness. There is the 'yea' which is joined with the 'nay' of some hard or unkindly condition—that is the welcome of reserve, austerity, constraint. How different with Christ! In Him is a 'yea' that is 'yea' indeed—absolutely genuine, absolutely gratuitous, absolutely free. Well speaks St. Paul of the simplicity that is in Christ, without partiality and without disguise.

When will some people learn this? When will some people learn that Christ really means what He says, and seeks to be dealt with by men in the self-same frank and ingenuous way He seeks to employ Himself? I speak of the timid. I speak of the

scrupulous. I speak of the morbidly diffident. How they often doubt Christ! How they often suspect Christ! As if, back of the 'yea' He so constantly addresses to them, there were a lurking and a grudging 'nay'! Have you never met with those who, from natural despondency, or from physical ill-health, will not take the Saviour at His simple word, and believe that the great salvation is for them? Why, it almost seems as if they regarded Christ, not as a gracious, willing friend, but as a cautious and grudging official, full of promises and formulas, slow to commit Himself, and always leaving loopholes of escape.

If you plead with such people, Has Christ not said so? they have always a 'but' in reply. 'True He has said it; but does He not mean something else?' 'True He has said it; but does He really say it to me?' Why, brethren, is that a fair or a kind way of meeting the overtures of One whose purposes are transparent as the flawless crystal, whose motives and whose aims are as pure as the sunlight on a summer morning. 'If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink.' 'Come unto Me, all ye that labour, and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest'; 'Him that cometh unto Me, I will in no wise cast out,'—how can you by any kind of perverted ingenuity put yourself outside the scope of such glorious invitations as these! Surely His 'yea' is 'yea' without any shadow or admixture of 'nay' at all. What though other voices bid you doubt—the voice of conscience, the voice of teachers, the voice of the enemy himself? Christ is greater than them all. Let Him be true, though everyone else be a liar! The welcome of Christ is a sincere welcome.

(2) And the welcome of Christ is a lasting welcome. All welcomes do not last. Some abide not because of change. The feelings alter. The relations alter. The bearing alters, and sometimes you are made plainly aware you have to do with the 'nay' of indifference, repulsion, and dismissal. Some welcomes, we say, abide not because of change. And some abide not because of death. One and another who would never have failed us, through alteration of feeling in themselves, drop off from the well-known places. They pass away from the long familiar work. And instead of the 'yea' that smiled in the light of bright eyes, and thrilled in the grasp of kind hands, there is nothing now but the 'nay' that sounds through empty

rooms and sighs upon silent graves. But in Christ and the friendship of Christ there is nothing but 'yea'—'yea' everlasting, 'yea' unchanging, 'yea' from the first, 'yea' to the last. As His welcome is exalted above all insincerity, so is it exalted above all removal and above all change.

Who then can e'er divide us more
From Jesus and His love,
Or break the sacred chain that binds
The earth to heaven above?

Experience only rivets its links. Death only shortens its length, bringing us nearer and binding us faster to Him to whose person we are joined.

IV.

In Christ we have the 'yea' of eternal security. We speak here of the doubts of anxious and timid believers. And we say Christ is the 'yea' of everlasting security. For the question may sometimes arise, True, Christ may always be willing to abide with *me*, but shall I be willing always to abide with *Him*?—He may be always content to be my host, with a place for me in His heart and His home, but shall I be always content to be His guest, going no more out? And the answer again is 'yea.' But in whom does that answer dwell? From whom does that answer come? Is it self with its frames, self with its feelings, self with its efforts? Ah! if self at any time answers 'yea' in its moods of elation and success, it will as often answer 'nay' in its moods of depression and defeat. Look away, then, from self altogether. Look to Christ. In Him is the guarantee that you look for, the guarantee which implies a perfect security, the guarantee which should issue in a perfect peace. Your hope of salvation is as certain as Christ can make it, assured to you by a three-fold 'yea.' He is 'yea' in the *steadfastness of His covenant engagements*, He is 'yea' in the *efficiency of His atoning work*, He is 'yea' in the *provisions of His forestalling grace*. Be not afraid, only believe.

Is your question this, Shall I run the race, shall I win the crown? He at whose call you have started, He by whose grace you go on, may be trusted to see to that. 'Yea' is His answer this day. It is My Father's will. It is My

Father's appointment. In the ages bygone He foreknew thee. And whom He foreknew, them He also predestinated. And whom He predestinated, them He also called. And whom He called, them He also justified. And whom He justified, them He also glorified. There is a 'yea' indeed, unalterable as God's own character, firm as God's own throne.

Thus I have tried to bring before you the meaning of this great and significant phrase: 'In Him is yea'—the 'yea' of *mediatorial compliance* in regard to the will of God; the 'yea' of *divine assurance* in regard to the perplexities of man; the 'yea' of *willing welcome* in regard to those who seek, the 'yea' of *eternal security* in regard to those who find. What think ye of Christ? What think ye of the certainty that is in Christ? Do not we daily learn that all is uncertainty, apart and away from Christ? The age is an age of uncertainty. The atmosphere is an atmosphere of uncertainty—intellectual, religious, social. Old standing-ground crumbles. Old beliefs disappear. Everywhere around us the rising tide is soaking, searching, sapping. And no one can tell what cherished theories, what ancient institutions, will go next. Where shall we look for permanence? Where shall we turn for rest? Where but in Christ? In Him is 'yea,' and in Him too all other things worth the using and preserving are 'yea' also, exempt from dissolution, secure from change, even the love of the friends He has lent us, the love of the work He has set us, the truth and the authority of the Scriptures He has given us, and the safety and stability of the Church He has formed for us. Try Him! Trust Him! There may be many a change in store for you. There may be many a change in store for the world around you. By and by there will come the greatest change of all, when the heavens above shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, and the earth and the works thereof shall be burned up. But among all such shaking, there are things that cannot be shaken. And among these are the work, the word, and the love of Christ, and the blessedness, spiritual and eternal, of all those who put their trust in Him.

Recent Foreign Theology.

The Oldest Gospel.¹

DR. JOHANNES WEISS is one of the most acute and progressive of the band of scholars at work on the New Testament, and the volume he has recently published on the Gospel of Mark will add considerably to his reputation. He writes with a critical eye steadily fixed upon Wrede's able but eccentric work, *Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien* (1901), one main thesis of which is to the effect that Mark represents Jesus as keeping His Messiahship a secret during His earthly life—a secret complete as regards the multitude, and partial even in the case of the Twelve. On most issues where these two scholars diverge, readers who value sanity and critical acumen will confess, we think, that their sympathies are with Weiss.

Briefly, the contribution of this book is its revival and strenuous advocacy of the *Urmarcus* hypothesis put forward by Weizsäcker as long ago as 1864.² In a short introduction Weiss makes some very wise and satisfactory observations on the common mistake of supposing that the two-document theory has solved the Synoptic problem without remainder. Simplicity in such a region is not the best certificate a theory can present. The phenomena will really not admit of simplification beyond a certain point, and it is worthy of remark that a recent writer, of conservative leanings, tabulates eight distinct sources which he believes are traceable in Matthew, Mark, and Luke. Mark, in Professor Weiss' opinion, is the oldest Gospel we possess, but it is not the earliest deposit of the evangelical tradition. Indeed, he is quite certain that our present text is not identical with the text that Matthew and Luke had before them. It has plainly been worked over, and now, in a good many passages, is much less original than the parallels. The editor, from whose hands our present Gospel came, had used the *Logia*. Parts even of his narrative have been drawn from that document. And one consequence is that many phrases and turns of expression,

which it has been usual to regard as suffused with the vivid memories of first-hand observation, are, to our disappointment, set down by Dr. Weiss to the redactor's instinct for style.

The book is divided into three long and crowded chapters. The first is in many respects the most attractive, dealing as it does with the literary and religious character of the Gospel. These pages (5-119) are full of good things. The second chapter is a running commentary on the entire Gospel, or rather perhaps a sustained attempt to sift out the original form of each paragraph, and, as it were, to mark with blue pencil the additions which Weiss believes to have been made by a later hand. The third chapter investigates the sources and the identity of the author. We cannot here comment upon the more or less detailed exegesis which occupies the greater part of the book, but some points of interest or novelty in its first and third sections may be noted.

In the first twenty pages we have a very fresh and informing discussion of the question, Do the Gospels belong to the literature of strict biography? This is the kind of subject in which Dr. Weiss is known to be specially at home; and no one who is interested in such prolegomena to Synoptic criticism should fail to read his forcible and ingenious handling of the difference between biography proper and a genuine Gospel-narrative.

Not that it is possible to acquiesce in all Professor Weiss' findings. He rejects the chronology of Mark absolutely. He rejects the view, which has almost attained to the dignity of a critical tradition, that in Mark we have a peculiarly vivid and trustworthy picture of Christ's inner life. On these two points, we are told, the iconoclastic Wrede is quite right, and deserves our admiration for his refusal to compromise. The fact is, Mark represents a stage on the way to the idealistic goal attained in the Gospel of John. (It is striking to note at how many points Weiss believes that Mark and John are in rather close contact, and takes occasion to speak favourably of the historical outline presented by the Fourth Gospel. The Paulinism of Mark is also the subject of frequent remark.) The eschatological discourse (xiii.) is held to have been for the evangelist a prophecy of Jesus not yet fulfilled; and founding largely on

¹ *Das älteste Evangelium: Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis des Markus-Evangeliums und der ältesten evangelischen Überlieferung.* Von Johannes Weiss, Professor zu Marburg. Glasgow: F. Bauermeister, 1903. Price 10s.

² *Untersuchungen über die evang. Geschichte*, pp. 65 ff.

this, Weiss concludes for 64-66 as the date of the Gospel. He thus gives his assent to the ancient tradition which placed its composition shortly after the death of Peter. On the whole, Weiss takes a high view of Mark's historical value. Though his aim was not to write a history in the strict sense, but a Gospel for the use of Churches, still the view which represents him as a *Lehrdichter*, fabricating his episodes to prove his doctrines, is to be decisively repudiated. And yet we are not quite satisfied with Weiss' results, nor do we feel that the presuppositions with which he approaches the critical study of the Gospels are likely to dispose him to complete impartiality. Take the casual remark at one point (p. 192), that it is psychologically impossible that Jesus should have believed Himself able to raise the dead. This is one of those *obiter dicta* which supply an attentive reader with food for thought. It is on the face of it an *a priori* presupposition, and one which must modify the entire interpretation of the Gospels. Writers who say such things, it is obvious, have in their minds a particular conception of God and Christ and nature, which they bring with them to the study of the facts of the past.

It will suffice, if from the second chapter we take the summary of its results. 'We have sought to prove,' says Professor Weiss, 'that the evangelist is not telling his story for the first time, but that at every point his foot is upon older tradition. And we have differentiated the following kinds and groups of traditional material: (a) the Petrine narratives; (b) doctrinal discussions; (c) words or discourses of Jesus with or without historical setting; (d) popular traditions of an indeterminate and often legendary character.'

As to sources, the passage just quoted is enough to prove that Weiss declines to refer the entire contents of the Gospel to the reminiscences of Peter. Papias notwithstanding, the evangelist must have drawn from other channels of information, and drawn, in the main, material of excellent quality. But Peter's recollections are the basis of the whole. They comprise 'anecdotes and little groups of narrative, which depict highly characteristic moments in the life of Jesus or Peter.' They give, not a full and orderly delineation of the life of Christ, but typical glimpses of His words and ways. They show us a personality under the influence of the supernatural beliefs of His time, full of enthusiasm and the sense of power, governed

supremely by the idea of Messiahship—an idea which was indeed the loftiest existing in that age, but so tragically inadequate to set forth His inward experience that it ultimately became His fate. Finally, Weiss confesses the absolutely problematical nature of his results. The Petrine residuum, when everything that is secondary has been strained out, is, and must be, a more or less uncertain quantity.

Over and above this Petrine basis the Gospel contains many words of Christ which Mark can only have drawn from the tradition of his time. The reason why he records only a limited number, it is plain, is that he felt no need to aim at completeness, or to repeat what was familiar already. He had before him, as he wrote, a fixed documentary collection of the words of the Lord, the *Logia* in short. And thus Professor Weiss substantially accepts the theory as to the relations of Mark to the *Logia* which has been put forward by his father, the famous exegete of Berlin; a theory later associated also with the name of Titius. Finally, we have a considerable list of passages which Weiss is inclined to label as legendary, or otherwise of second-rate historical importance. These are the story of the Baptist's death, the cursing of the fig tree, the prodigies which attended the death of Jesus, the empty grave; and, perhaps,—though this is less certain,—the healing of the withered hand, the healing of the blind man at Jericho, and the cure of him that was both blind and deaf (p. 380).

The forty concluding pages, occupied with the question of Mark's identity, do not appear to be on the same level of historical grasp or seriousness as the rest. Weiss leans to the view that the author of the Second Gospel was not John Mark, the man of Jerusalem and cousin to Barnabas, but a Roman Mark, who, as a close follower of Peter, is to be distinguished from the other. It is but justice, however, to say that he does not press the point. Further light may be cast upon it by the solution of the Johannine problem.

We believe that the volume before us will figure prominently in the Synoptic discussions of the next few years. It is well written, with a lucid power of movement and a vivacity of imagination that never fail. At times, it may be, we are tempted to say that the author is clear and telling, not perhaps because his mind is of the superficial cast, but because it is deliberately averted from the deeper questions; because it confronts the story of the

Gospels with presuppositions of a minimizing kind, and is a little unaware of the wonder and glory of the Figure they present. Such things are bound to affect his estimate of the probability of a miracle, or the authenticity of a saying. They modify a man's view of evidence.

It is the soul that sees ; the outward eyes
Present the object ; but the mind describes.

Yet such acuteness, such labour, such untiring love of knowledge and of truth, such faith in the essential supremacy of Christ, cannot but prove to have made a real contribution, and to have cleared the path of some obstinate impediments. Others will correct Professor Weiss' mistakes ; all may learn from his method and his candour.

H. R. MACKINTOSH.

Aberdeen.

Marti's 'Minor Prophets': Part I.

PROFESSOR MARTI is to be congratulated on the fact that the end of his arduous enterprise as editor of the *Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Alten Testament* is now well in sight. And its readers are to be congratulated because the concluding volume is from his own pen. Whatever he writes is worth attention. He is thoroughly conversant with the almost overwhelming mass of Old Testament literature which grows with such amazing rapidity at the present time ; he has a sound judgment ; he is not afraid of difficulties, but after paying due heed to the manner in which others have treated them, is quite prepared to attack them in his own way. This first half of the commentary on the Minor Prophets,¹ embracing Hosea, Joel, Amos, and Obadiah, will add to his reputation.

Here are extracts, slightly abbreviated, from the passages in which he characterizes the three prophets with whom he is chiefly occupied : 'The keynote which resounds throughout HOSEA's compositions is one of lamentation and grief over the failure of the Israelites in love and fidelity towards Yahweh, and their inability to see that they have brought themselves to the verge of ruin. But their lack of love and fidelity towards Him springs from their not having the knowledge of God. By this Hosea does not mean the knowledge of a written

law, but the inward perception of God's Nature and Will. He who neglects the demands of morality not only transgresses external ordinances but also betrays a grave deficiency of the sense of duty, and thus evinces that he is not in a right position and spiritual relation to God. This is Hosea's fundamental idea, and he has therefore been correctly called a "mystic" and a "John-like soul," although these expressions must not be pressed to mean more than that Hosea differs from Amos in that the latter is profoundly sensible of the absolute Might of God, and lays stress on the moral element in religion, whilst Hosea puts the emphasis on the religious element, on the *source* of our ability to be moral and to do the Will of God. His aim coincides with that of Amos, but in going right to the roots of moral and religious conduct he displays a deeper knowledge of the nature of true religion. . . . Hosea manifests the depth of his comprehension of religion by employing the fellowship of marriage to set forth the union between Yahweh and His people, and thus finding a way of setting before the people the enormity of their sins. But he does not look on marriage as a mere legal relation, in accordance with which the wife was regarded as her husband's property : he thinks of it as an inward, ethical relationship of Love. . . . Recognizing the analogy between his own painful domestic experiences and Israel's behaviour towards Yahweh, Hosea completely overcame the old Semitic notion that the relationship between a god and his land was a merely natural one, and substituted for it the far deeper view that the bond betwixt Yahweh and Israel was a moral and religious one. . . . The whole of Israel's estrangement from Yahweh showed itself in the ritual, which, both in character and origin, corresponded with Baal and not with Yahweh, and was not Israelite but Canaanite.'²— 'AMOS begins a new period. . . . One knows not which to admire the most in this shepherd from Tekoa, the astounding clearness and freshness or the grand simplicity and profundity of his thoughts, or, finally, that breadth of view which was due to his unwavering certainty as to the true nature of Israelite religion. His fundamental view may be expressed in a couple of simple statements : Religion and Morality, God and Goodness, are not to be sundered ; he who serves and honours Yahweh does the right and follows the good, nor is

¹ *Dodekapropheten*. Erklärt von Dr. Karl Marti. Tübingen u. Leipzig : J. C. B. Mohr, 1903.

² Pp. 5, 6.

there any true religion save where morality supports and completes it. But Yahweh is the living force and the personal power who represents this moral order and decides the life and destiny of the nations in accordance therewith. We can see the consequences for the religion of Yahweh involved in this energetic exaltation of the unconditional value of the moral and the good. Amos was aware of them. Yahweh is not the God of Israel alone. . . . Nor is it possible to miss seeing that although we have not here the name *monotheism*, the thing itself is present in full vigour, a different sort of monotheism, too, from that reached by the priests in Babylonia and Egypt. There, in Babylonia and Egypt, a speculative monotheism, powerless and indifferent as regards the polytheism of the multitude, whose gods this theory allegorizes and dissolves into a general idea; here, in the Israelite prophets, a mighty, living faith in Yahweh, who watches jealously over the worship of Himself alone, and, as the one Ruler, directs the destinies of men. The monotheisms of Babylon and the Bible are in no way connected or interdependent: their radically diverse origins determine their unlikeness. There, in Egypt and Babylon, it is a Theory: in Israel it is Force and Life.¹—‘JOEL does not give us the impression of a man standing out in contrast with his fellow-citizens, like an Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, or Jeremiah, as a prophet maintaining another view than that of the populace. He has no word of blame for any kind of sin. He seems rather to be the advocate of the multitude, uttering their thoughts and recommending the same measures as they all had thought of, and as the speaker and poet who expresses in words the consolation which is involved in the common faith. . . . We see [in this book] how the prophets gradually became teachers of eschatology and poets drawing eschatological pictures. . . . The importance of the book as indicating the form and contents of the eschatological hope thus cherished by the community is enhanced by the fact that it sums up in an instructive compendium *all* the leading features of their eschatological expectancy. Hence the Book of Joel is a weighty document for the faith of the Jewish community after its consolidation by Ezra-Nehemiah.’²—OBADIAH’S work, of course, does not lend itself to such a study as the preceding, and we need do no more than mention Marti’s conclusions as to

its composition. He agrees with those who date the first part (excepting certain interpolations) in the beginning of the fifth century B.C., and the second part, vv.¹⁰⁻²¹, at the end of the third or beginning of the second century.

A few points in the treatment of each of the other three books deserves attention.

First, as to the vexed question of Hosea’s personal experiences. Marti rightly insists that when the prophet married Gomer he had no idea of her dissolute character, no prevision of her abominable conduct. But the trouble came upon him in accordance with the divine will, in order that he might perceive the similarity between his wife’s treatment of him and Israel’s behaviour towards God, and might feel how God was grieved even as *he* was.³ On internal grounds, textual and exegetical, Marti judges chap. 3 to be an addition by a much later writer, who thought that chap. 1 was an allegory representing Yahweh’s union with Judah, and wrote this story of Hosea’s marriage to a second wife [not re-marriage with Gomer] as a figure of the divine relationship to Israel.⁴

Textual and other problems in Hosea are dealt with in such ways as these:—At 2¹⁵ וְעָלְתָּי is read for וְעָלְתָּי and וְעָלְתָּי. The translation will then run, ‘And I will give her her vineyards, and will make the valley of Achor a door of hope, and she shall go up there,’ etc. The comment is, ‘Israel is to regain her vineyards in the Promised Land: the valley of Achor (cf. Jos 7²⁴. 26 15⁷, Is 65¹⁰), through which the people formerly marched into the mountain district from Jericho, is to be again the *door of hope* for them, a door through which they enter into glorious prosperity.’ On ‘cakes of raisins’ [3¹ A.V., ‘flagons of wine’], we find these remarks, ‘It is well known that cakes of raisins played an important part in the worship of the “other gods”; at festival and sacrifice the worshippers could present them to the gods, and, yet more, might themselves enjoy them. The eating them as a ritual act no doubt originated amongst a people who cultivated the vine; to the many examples of its prevalence in heathendom, Judaism, and Christianity, we may add that cakes used in the worship of the other gods are spoken of in Jer 7¹⁸, and that the Collyridian women, who as heathen Arabs had done this in honour of the goddess Uzza, transferred it to the Virgin

¹ Pp. 148, 149.

² P. 114.

³ P. 15.

⁴ P. 34.

Mary, and offered to her the *κολλυρίδες*, the cakes. Compare also the fruit-jelly, *הרכות*, a mixture of raisins, cinnamon, and nuts, at the Passover to-day.' The M.T. of 3^{sb} can hardly be correct. Marti selects those emendations which involve a very slight change, and bring the sense into harmony with the preceding clause, *אֵינִי לָךְ* for *אֵינִי*, and *לָךְ* for *אֵלֶיךָ*. . . . At 5^{1b} he again adopts suggestions already made, substituting *וְשָׂחַת הַשָּׂמִים הַעֲמִיקוּ* for the altogether incomprehensible *וְשָׂחַת הַשָּׂמִים הַעֲמִיקוּ*, and at the end of the verse reading *וְאִין מוֹסֵר לְכָלֶם*, 'For ye have become a snare for Mizpeh and a net spread out upon Tabor, and ye make the pit at Shittim deep, and there is no amendment for you all.' Everyone agrees that *הָדָשׁ* cannot stand in 5⁷: Wellhausen would read *יִהְיֶה*. This is the simplest method, and it does not necessitate any change of subject: 'Yahweh will consume them; He will lay waste their fields.' For these reasons it seems better than Marti's replacing of *הָדָשׁ* by *מִשְׁחִית* and addition of the verb *וְיִהְיֶה* or *וְיִהְיֶה*. . . . On the other hand, it is impossible to agree with Wellhausen that the *שׁוּ* which the LXX had for *צוּ* in 5¹¹ is not sufficiently explicit. The thought is, as Marti sees, that in worshipping idols the Israelites were following vanity, vain things that do not profit. The suggestion that 6^{sb} should immediately follow 6^a is a useful one. Others have pointed out that the M.T. *מִשְׁפָּטִי אִזֹּר* is a corruption of *מִשְׁפָּטִי בְּאִזֹּר*. Marti believes that *מִשְׁפָּטִי* is an error, *מִשְׁפָּטִי* being the original. This would give a good sense and perfect consecution of ideas.

It is an excellent illustration of the ever-fresh and varied interest which in our day makes Old Testament studies so delightful, to be reminded here that the name JOEL 'has been found on three small clay-tablets of the age of Hammurabi, in the Assyrian form *Ja-a'-ve* (*Ja-ve*, or *Ja-ū-um*) *ilu*. . . . Whether the name Yahweh goes back to a great antiquity and was borrowed from a foreign people (and if so, whatever people it may have been), Joel=Yahweh is God, had an altogether different signification in Joel's time from what it had in Babylonia in the days of Hammurabi.' Joel's time, according to Marti's estimate, is about 400 B.C., and this estimate cannot be far wrong. At all events, it is abundantly clear that

Joel belongs to the later rather than the earlier prophets.

There is no need to adduce more than a single instance of the exegesis of this prophecy. The army of locusts which invaded Judea is called *הַצֹּפְנִי*, the Northerner, in 2²⁰. But these destructive hordes usually pour into the land from the south or south-east. Marti is inclined to the view that the epithet originated in those predictions of an enemy marching from the north which are found in Jeremiah and Ezekiel. Ezekiel conceived of this foe as a harbinger of the day of the Lord; Joel looked on the locusts in the same light. 'The etymological derivation has lost its significance. The idea has become an apocalyptic one, with the meaning, *The herald of the last judgment*.'

Marti differs somewhat from Baumann's view of the way in which the component parts of the Book of Amos were put together.¹ He imagines that after the prophet's return to Judea he either wrote the substance of his various addresses in the form of separate pamphlets, or, if himself unable to write, dictated the matter to those who could. These pamphlets may have been collected and made into a book in Isaiah's time, when the kingdom of Israel had fallen, and much interest was taken in those predictions by Amos which had been so fully verified by the event. In any case, Marti feels that there is much to find fault with in the present arrangement, and we shall not greatly err if we go with him in thinking that the narrative section, 7¹⁰⁻¹⁷, once stood directly after 9⁷, and was displaced when the appendix, 9⁸⁻¹⁵, was added subsequently to the Exile.

Probably no one is quite clear as to what the word can have been which is represented in the M.T. by *הַרְמוֹנָה* (Am 4⁸). Marti is right in rejecting Cheyne's *יִרְחֵמְאֵלָה*. But one hesitates to accept his idea that *עֲרֻמוֹת*, supported by the *γυμναί* of the LXX, earlier in the verse, should be read. Has anything more likely been offered so far than *הַשְּׁלֵכְתִּי מֵאַרְמוֹנֵי*? In common with the majority of recent students he takes 5²⁶ to be an interpolation, describing the conduct of the later inhabitants of North Israel, 'who, after the deportation of the Israelites and the settlement of foreigners in the land, worshipped both Yahweh and Assyrio-Baby-

¹ See THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, xv. p. 65.

Ionian gods. . . . כַּבּוֹת and כִּיֹּן are names of Assyrio-Babylonian deities: The first, Sakkut, is a secondary name of the god Ninib (?)—Saturn; the second, Kewan, is Kaivānu, the god Saturn. As here, so in Assyrian texts, they are found side by side. . . . The original ran thus, "And did ye also carry about in procession your king Sakkut (your Sakkut-melek, cf. Adar-melek, 2 K. 17³¹) and your god Kewan, which you made for yourselves?" The reference to David in 6⁵ has considerably exercised the ingenuity of emendators. Marti would read, though with some hesitation, כְּדוֹרֵי בְּשִׁיר, 'they imagine themselves skilled in song like David.' Would the Hebrew words quite bear this meaning? Nowack's alteration of בְּלִי into בָּל is a very gentle procedure, and gives a possible, if not quite satisfactory meaning, 'Every kind of song, songs of all sorts.' One of the most striking of Marti's restorations is that at the opening of 6¹⁰. וְנִשְׁאַר דּוֹר וּמִקְרָפוֹ is a phrase which has almost defied interpretation. The clue here followed is furnished by וְנִשְׁאַר עֵין יִעָרֵךְ מִקְרָפֹה (Is 10¹⁹), after which Marti emends thus: וְנִשְׁאַר דּוֹר מִקְרָפֹה. The order of thought will then be, 'And it shall come to pass that if there remain ten men in one house they shall die, and there shall be left but few to bring the dead [עֲצָמִים, מֵתִים] out of the house.' Marti resists the temptation to alter v.^{10b}; contenting himself with the M.T., he gives this explanation, 'The last inhabitant who remains alive has taken refuge in the inmost chamber of the house, believing that he may there hide from the angry God who is passing through His people (5¹⁷). But he who finds him is terrified lest the mention of the divine name should call God's attention to the person who has hitherto been spared, and so bring down wrath on him.' So many good scholars now maintain that דּוֹר should be read for דָּרָךְ in 8¹⁴ that one hesitates to express dissent. But surely Arabic usage disproves the view maintained in this commentary that people could not swear either by the pilgrimage to Beer Sheba or by the ritual practised there.

Enough has been said to show our sense of the value of this latest addition to the literature on the Minor Prophets. Some of us will deem it indispensable. One little grumble may be permitted to an Englishman. Such a work as G. A. Smith's

Book of the Twelve Prophets ought to have been mentioned in the section entitled LITERATURE at the close of each Introduction. J. TAYLOR.

Winchcombe.

Baljon's 'Acts of the Apostles.'

PROFESSOR BALJON has taken in hand the great and useful enterprise of producing a learned commentary on the New Testament in the Dutch language. The present volume on the Acts is an instalment of this work, and the professor hopes to bring out a fresh volume every year.

This volume contains no introductory matter. For this we are referred to the author's Dutch *History of the Books of the New Testament*, 1901. The Greek text assumed, though not reproduced, is that of the author's *Novum Testamentum græce*.

The author's method is to give his translation of a section, followed by a critical and exegetical commentary of the passage, verse by verse. He takes due account of the work of others who have preceded him in the same field, including recent writers like Wendt and Ramsay. For those who read Dutch this will be found an able, up-to-date, and impartial commentary on this important book of Holy Scripture. The author's standpoint may be described as Liberal-Evangelical.

W. AFFLECK.

Auchtermuchty.

The 'Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique.'

TWELVE parts of this dictionary—one of the boldest of modern enterprises in dictionary-making—have now been issued. They contain 3998 columns, each column contains 650 words; and yet the alphabet is covered only as far as the word BORIS, not quite the end of its second letter. What does the Dictionary contain?

It contains chiefly biography and geography. There is also a little theology. The Antiquities of the Church are not in this dictionary, but in its

¹ *Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*. By Dr. J. M. S. Baljon. Utrecht: J. van Boekhoven, 1903. ('Commentaar op de Handelingen,' etc.)

² *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique*. Par A. Vacant et E. Mangenot. Paris: Letouzey et Ané. Fasc. I.-XII., 1899-1904. 5 fr. net, each.

companion, the *Dictionnaire d'Archéologie*. Even the Churches and the Sects are not here. It is the Biography that occupies the space. What a roll it is! All the Saints who from their labours rest! And yet the Saints are not all here. Rich as the book is in names and deeds, there are a thousand times ten thousand and thousands upon thousands who are not mentioned. The greatest, perhaps, are here, and perhaps the least great. That mighty army of sainthood which comes between, and in each generation was the salt and light of the earth, is absent. They rejoiced, and so do we, that *their* names were written in heaven.

The range is wide. All the Old Testament saints are included and all the New. The Catholic Church claims ADAM as well as AUGUSTINE. ABRAHAM occupies twenty-two columns, and is divided into four distinct articles: the Call of Abraham, the Sacrifice of Isaac, the Messianic Promise, and Abraham's Bosom. The articles are not as a rule overloaded with detail. AUGUSTINE AND AUGUSTINIANISM occupy col. 2268 to col. 2561, and there is no waste. It is the vast host of short articles that runs away with the space. But the short articles are as well done as the long.

The Bibliography is perhaps the best executed and most valuable feature of the work. Few books are missed, whatever their language or country. And the selection shows that of the greater part the writer has a first-hand acquaintance.

The writers are simply the best that the French Catholic Church can furnish. Some of them have a world-wide reputation. They are young men often, yet they are learned men always. Take it all in all, it is difficult to understand how any student of the Church in any country can do without the *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique*.

The 'Dictionnaire d'Archéologie Chrétienne et de Liturgie.'¹

THE fourth part of this magnificent work contains an article on AKHMÎN, by Dom H. Leclercq, which lays the scattered information regarding that interesting Egyptian place, and the discoveries made at it, clearly and succinctly before our eyes. The illustrations include one in colour. But the greatest article is on ALEXANDRIA. It is divided into seven parts: Introduction, Topography, Epigraphy, Council, Catechetical School, Library, Bibliography. It occupies nearly a hundred great columns. It also is the work of Dom Leclercq. The article AGRAPHHA, however, is disappointingly short. It is practically a summary of the book of Professor J. H. Ropes, who contributes the article (a far longer one) to the Extra Volume of the *Dictionary of the Bible*.

¹ *Dictionnaire d'Archéologie Chrétienne et de Liturgie*. Par Le R. P. dom Fernand Cabrol. Paris: Letouzey et Ané. Fasc. IV., Agneau—Alexandria. 5 fr. net.

The Jewish Prayer-Book.

By THE REV. G. H. BOX, M.A., HEBREW MASTER AT MERCHANT TAYLORS' SCHOOL, LONDON.

II. General Survey.

IT is necessary to remind the reader that there are three daily services in the synagogue, namely, evening, morning, and afternoon prayer; that on Sabbath and holy days these are increased by the 'additional' or *mûsâf*, which follows immediately on morning prayer; and that before public prayer can be said a congregation of ten males, of more than thirteen years of age, must be present. For full details, however, regarding these and other points touching the conduct of divine worship in the synagogue reference must be made elsewhere.¹

¹ Cf. e.g. Dembitz, *op. cit.* pp. 64-81.

Our immediate task is to form some idea of the character, structure, and sequence of the prayers that make up the Jewish Liturgy.

(a) *Language*.—All the prayers are written and chanted in the sacred tongue, *i.e.* Hebrew, with the exception of a few which are written in the cognate Aramaic dialect. It is curious to notice that in some cases the same formula appears in both Hebrew and Aramaic. An example can be seen in Singer, p. 73 (bottom) and p. 74 (top). Of course Hebrew has for more than two thousand years ceased to be a living language among the Jews.

In the time of our Lord Aramaic was the popular language among the Jews of Palestine, and continued still so to be for some centuries later; and this was true also of the Jews in Babylonia. When our Lord spoke in the synagogue and expounded the Scriptures, He used the Aramaic language. In fact it was, as is well known, the regular practice for the Scriptures to be read in Hebrew, and translated by a *methurgemān*, or interpreter, verse by verse, or paragraph by paragraph, into the Aramaic vernacular. Outside of Palestine, among the Jews of the Dispersion in Greek-speaking countries the case was different. There Greek was largely, if not exclusively, used. It seems that not only the Scriptures, but also the most important parts (if not all) of the Liturgy—such as the *Shema* and the *Shemōnēh 'Esrēh*—were regularly recited in the Hellenistic synagogues in Greek, and not in Hebrew at all.¹ And even in the Mishnā sanction is given to the use of any language whatever in repeating the *Shema*, the *Shemōnēh 'Esrēh*, and the grace at meals.² Still the paramount importance of Hebrew was always insisted on by the Rabbis, and according to Rabbinical law every father was bound to teach his child Hebrew as soon as it began to speak.³ In later practice Hebrew has been the only language recognized as legitimate for prayer and worship.

I allude to this point here more particularly, because the Jewish community in London is at the present time agitated by the question as to whether the vernacular should be recognized in public worship or not. There is a demand in certain quarters for the use of English in the public services, which has found expression in the recently organized services of the Jewish Religious Union.

So much, then, for the external form of the Jewish prayers. They are written and chanted in the sacred tongue, with a slight admixture of Aramaic, which, it must be remembered, is also the original language of some parts of the Old Testament.

(b) *Influence of the Sacrificial Worship of the Temple on the Synagogue Liturgy.*—Regarding the structure of the liturgical forms it is important to remember that this has been fundamentally influenced by the sacrificial worship of the Temple.

Long before the destruction of Jerusalem, and the consequent cessation of the sacrificial system, the synagogue had come into existence, and firmly established itself wherever Jewish communities flourished. It met a widespread religious need, owing to the centralization of the sacrificial worship in Jerusalem. While only a limited number of Jews could be present at any one time in the central sanctuary, and assist in the offering of the sacrifice, no such disability would apply to the services of the synagogue. To a certain though limited extent, indeed, the synagogue was affiliated to the Temple worship. It will be remembered that for purposes of the daily sacrificial worship, not only the priests and Levites, but also the lay Israelites generally were divided into twenty-four courses of service, 'each of which had to take its turn in coming before God [in the Temple], every day for a whole week, by way of representing the whole body of the people, while the daily sacrifice was being offered to Jehovah.'⁴ But it appears that not the whole division of Israelites on duty, but only a deputation from it, was actually present at any given time in the Temple; the others, who had been left behind, assembled in the local synagogues (at the time when the sacrifice was actually offered in the Temple), and engaged in prayer and the reading of Scripture (see Taanith iv. 2).

Still the synagogue was essentially independent of the priesthood and the sacrificial cult, and was entirely free from the limitations applying to a centralized worship and a sacerdotal system. Hence, when the latter disappeared in the great catastrophe of 70 A.D., the synagogue was the one institution exactly fitted to be the instrument for the reconstruction of Judaism.

The synagogue now became not merely supplementary to the Temple worship, but took its place. And this fact has profoundly influenced not merely the structure of its Liturgy, but also the form and substance of its prayers. *The question is often asked, What is the modern Jewish attitude towards sacrifice?* If the sacrificial system was necessary in order to maintain communion with God, how can the Jews reconcile themselves to their present religious condition—which has lasted now for more than eighteen centuries—without priest, altar, or sacrifice?

The Jewish answers to this question are, perhaps, not quite consistent. On the one hand the Rabbis

¹ Cf. Schürer, iv. 283 ff. (E.T.); also iii. p. 10.

² Sota, vii. 1 (exceptions, 2).

³ Tosepht. Hag. begin.; cf. B. Sukkā, 42a.

⁴ Schürer, iii. 275 f.

taught that 'charity or repentance was an accepted substitute or equivalent for sacrifice.' The following quotation will illustrate the Rabbinical view:—*At this time, when there is no Temple, and we have no altar, there is no atonement but repentance. Repentance atones for all transgressions, yea, though a man be wicked all his days, and repent at last, none of his wickedness is mentioned to him, for it is said, As for the wickedness of the wicked, he shall not fall thereby in the day that he turneth from his wickedness* (Ezk 33¹²).¹ On the other hand the traditional Liturgy provides a sort of parabolic and metaphorical fulfilment of sacrifice in the following ways:—

1. By providing forms of prayer for daily worship which correspond to the original daily sacrifice. One of these—the afternoon service—actually bears the name of the original offering (*minchā*). In accordance with this principle those days which were originally provided with additional sacrifices (Sabbaths, new moons, and festivals) are now provided with additional forms of prayer (*mūsāf*=additional).

2. Special sections from the Law and the Mishnā, which contain the original enactments about the daily and Sabbath offerings, are placed at the beginning of the service (cf. Singer, pp. 9 ff.). And on high days and festivals it is the rule to supplement the Pentateuch lesson by the paragraph from the Law which enumerates the sacrifices enacted for the day. For instance, during the Feast of Tabernacles the paragraph Nu 29¹²⁻³⁹ is read in addition, from a second scroll. The principle underlying all this is stated in a Haggadic passage in the Talmud. Abraham is there represented 'to have anxiously asked God how the sins of Israel would be forgiven when their Temple was destroyed, and they should have no place where to bring their sacrifices, and he was told that to read the duty of these sacrifices from the *Tōrā* would be accepted as a full equivalent.'²

3. Various prayers have been inserted in the Liturgy which breathe the hope and supplication that the Temple service may be restored. In some cases an older prayer has been amplified in this sense. It is doubtful, however, whether if even the Exile could be brought to an end, and the Jewish race were once more gathered into Palestine, with

full control of the land, the Temple and its sacrificial worship would be resumed. According to so orthodox a Jewish writer as Dr. Friedländer³ such a revival could only take place even then if 'sanctioned by the divine voice of a prophet.'

Judaism may therefore, with justice, be said almost completely to have spiritualized the sacrificial idea. The daily offering of prayer, praise, and thanksgiving morning and afternoon in the synagogue is a spiritual counterpart and fulfilment of the old daily sacrifice in the Temple. In this way the words of the prophet Hosea are in spirit complied with: *We shall render as bullocks (the offering of) our lips* (Hos 14²).

(c) *General Character of the Prayers.*—Perhaps the most striking feature about the synagogue prayers in general is their scriptural character. Not only are whole Psalms, passages, and single verses used, but the material of those prayers, which are not directly scriptural citations, is largely drawn from the sacred writings. Sometimes it is a striking allusion to some point in Scripture that we meet with, or it may be an adaptation of a scriptural sentence, as when, for instance, the promise: *I will restore thy judges as at the first, and thy counsellors as at the beginning* (Is 1²⁶) becomes a petition: *Restore our judges as at the first*, etc. (*Amidā xi*; Singer, p. 48).

The great Benediction recited before the *Shema* begins with a phrase, which strikes the keynote of the whole composition, and which has an unmistakably scriptural ring: *With great (or everlasting) love thou hast loved us, O Lord our God*, etc. (Singer, p. 39). This is an echo of Jeremiah's language (31³): *Thou hast loved thy people, the House of Israel, with everlasting love*: and from the opening words of this phrase the Benediction gets its technical name (*Ahabā Rabbā*=*with great love*).

Then, again, the Jewish Prayer-Book resembles the English in the congregational character of its language. The first person plural is used throughout, at any rate in those prayers which are recited publicly: the 'we' of the petitions includes all Israel.

In this connexion it should be noted that the only proper name recognized in the liturgy for the Jewish people is the sacred name of Israel. 'Israel' or 'The House' or 'People of Israel,' or 'God's people,' are spoken of; never 'Jews.'

¹ *Hilchoth Teshūbhā*, c.1. 2 (cited in McCaul, *Old Paths*, p. 386).

² Dembitz, *op. cit.* p. 259 (cf. B. Taanith, 27b).

³ *Jewish Religion*, p. 417.

'Jerusalem' and 'Zion,' moreover, are always place-names.

As regards the names of God, in the earlier compositions the scriptural names are employed. In the later, however, periphrastic designations are more commonly used, the most frequent being 'The Holy One, blessed be He.' We also meet with the mysterious Rabbinic designation, 'The Place' (*ha-Māqôm*), which is sometimes rendered 'The Omnipresent,' but the real explanation of which is quite uncertain.

Other forms of address found are: 'Our Father which (art) in Heaven'; as 'Our Father, Our King'; and 'The Merciful' (*ha-rahmān*), from which last Mohammed may have derived the epithet so frequently used in the Koran (e.g. in the recurring formula: *In the name of God the compassionate, the merciful*).

It is well known that the great personal name of God, which is familiar to us as 'Jehovah,' is now never pronounced by the Jews. Instead, they substitute the word 'Lord' (*Adōnai*) or, in some cases, 'God' (*Elōhim*). In the time of the Temple the 'four-lettered name' as it is called, or the Tetragrammaton¹ was pronounced by the high-priest in the services of the Day of Atonement, and also occasionally by the ordinary priests in the formula of the Priestly Blessing. But even then the pronunciation of the name, with these exceptions, was regarded as impious, and this feeling is reflected in the LXX, which consistently renders it by the term 'The Lord' (ὁ Κύριος).

It is probable that its pronunciation was ultimately discountenanced altogether owing to its superstitious use in working miracles. As is well known the true vocalization of the word is, according to the opinion of the majority of modern scholars, *Jahvêh*.

(d) *The Elements of the Liturgy and Analysis of the Morning Service*.—The constituent elements that make up the Jewish Liturgy may be roughly analysed as follows:—

1. *Benedictions* (*Berākhôth*), which consists of thanksgivings for various occasions, or for the performance of some pious duty enjoined in the Law. Special *Berākhôth* are also recited before and after the *Shema*.

2. *Sacrifices*.—Passages from the Bible and post-biblical writings, which set forth the injunctions

¹ The Jewish term is *Shēm ma-nephōrāsh* (שם המפורש), i.e. *The Ineffable Name*.

concerning the sacrifices (technical name: *Sacrifices*).

3. *Study*.—Specimen passages from post-biblical literature which are intended to remind the good Jew of the importance of sacred study, as a religious obligation.

4. *Thanksgiving*.—Psalms and hymns of praise and thanksgiving. Some of the hymns are especially noticeable,

5. *Confession of Faith*.—The central expression of this is the *Shema*; the more formal, the Creed of Maimonides.

6. *Petition*.—Prayers for the granting of various benefits—always, or almost always, with reference to Israel—are numerous. Perhaps the most important are embodied in the great *Amidā* prayer. (the so-called 'Eighteen Blessings').

7. *Confession of Sin and Supplication for Forgiveness*.—The element of confession (*widduy*) has been elaborately worked out, especially in connexion with the Atonement-Day services. Prayers of supplication (*tachanūnim*) are also frequent, and special litanies of forgiveness (*selichôth*), in poetical form, have been elaborated. The latter are used in connexion with the penitential period culminating in the Day of Atonement.

Some general idea of the sequence of these elements, and the structure of a Jewish service in the synagogue, can be formed from a short analysis of the daily morning prayer. The morning service, as set forth in Singer (pp. 1-94), is made up as follows, and in the following order:—

(1) *Blessings of the Morning* (ברכות השחר), referring to the change from night to day, from sleep to fresh life, from rest to activity (Singer, pp. 4 ff.).

(2) *Sacrifices and Study*.—Passages from the Bible and post-biblical writings referring to the daily sacrificial service in the Temple (Singer, pp. 9 ff.), and an extract from the *Baraita* (Singer, p. 13 f.; cp. also the short extract from the Mishna (p. 5).

These passages were inserted as a short sample and minimum of study. The passages dealing with the sacrifices have also another purpose, which has already been explained.

(3) *Psalms and Sections of Praise* (מומרים or פסוקי דמורה).—Various Psalms and Psalm-pieces culminating in the Red Sea song (Ex 15), and closing with the Benediction of Song (Singer, pp. 17-36). (4) *Half-Kaddish* (p. 37), followed by the *Shema* and its eulogies (or Benedictions), before and after (pp. 37-44); (5) *The Shemōnêh-Esrêh*

(‘*Eighteen Blessings*’) or *Aniḏā Prayer* (pp. 44-54); (6) *Supplications* (תחנונים)—‘And David said’ (p. 62), Ps 6 (penitential), ‘O Guardian of Israel’ (pp. 64-65), followed by *Half-Kaddish*; (7) *Psalms 145 and 20*, followed by ‘And a Redeemer shall come,’ and ‘But Thou art Holy,’ etc. (pp. 71-75); then (8) *Full Kaddish*, ‘It is our duty,’ and *Mourner’s Kaddish* (pp. 75-78); (9) *The Psalm for the Day* (pp. 80 ff.).

Such in broad outline is the structure and sequence of one of the typical synagogue services. The liturgical material of which the morning service is composed enters largely also into the other services, as the student can see for himself.

Here I may be permitted to make one final remark on the Jewish Liturgy as a whole. It is worth noticing how prominently—not to say how predominantly—the element of praise and thanksgiving enters into it. It seems to dominate Jewish worship generally—which is essentially joyous—with the exception, of course, of the Atonement-period, when the penitential note is most pronounced. Some reservations must, however, be made. The prayers are, on the whole, decidedly particularistic in character. Benefits for Israel, Israel’s superiority over the nations, and privileged position before God are constantly insisted on;

and the element of intercession, as we understand it, is almost wholly absent.

Nevertheless the Jewish prayers breathe a spirit of the loftiest devotion. If Israel’s privileged position is insisted upon, this but serves to deepen the sense of present inadequacy of character and achievement, and gives occasion for the expression of passionate longing and supplication for the people to be made worthy of its high vocation and destiny. Israel’s sublime faith in God’s faithfulness to His promises never wavers here. Yet while faithful and true to His chosen people, with whom He has a special personal relationship, based upon the unique history of Israel in the past, the God of Abraham and of Israel is conceived as above all else the Holy One, and the consummation of religion will only be reached when His name is sanctified throughout the world.

Such an aspiration as this—and it is expressed in the most popular, and most frequently repeated of the Jewish prayers, the *Kaddish*—is surely prophetic of a larger Judaism to come, when, emancipated from particularistic elements, but without losing its individuality or identity, the religion of the great Jewish people shall take its place as a constituent element in the world-religion of the future.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

ACTS x. 38.

‘Jesus of Nazareth, how that God anointed Him with the Holy Ghost and with power: who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil; for God was with Him.’—R.V.

EXPOSITION.

‘Jesus of Nazareth, how that God anointed Him with the Holy Ghost and with power.’—Jesus . . . Him, (Ἰησοῦν αὐτόν). The acc. thrown prominently forward and then the pronoun inserted pleonastically after the verb. Great emphasis is thus thrown on Jesus of Nazareth; it being Peter’s object to emphasize the fact that Jesus, the man Jesus of Nazareth, was declared to be the Messiah.—PAGE.

‘Anointed.’—This was understood by Cyril of Jerusalem, by Ambrose, Jerome, and Bede as pointing primarily to the Incarnation, the Unction being supplemented at Christ’s Baptism.—COOK.

THE moment specially in view is the Baptism, after which we read of Jesus as ‘full of the Holy Spirit,’ as returning ‘in the power of the Spirit into Galilee.’—BARTLET.

‘Who went about doing good.’—Just the conception of Christ’s ministry set before us in the Gospels of Mark and Luke in particular.—BARTLET.

‘And healing all that were oppressed of the Devil’—*oppressed*. Rather, *tyrannized over by*.—In what strong contrast with God’s fatherly chastisements.—COOK.

THIS word forcibly expresses the tyranny with which the Devil domineers over the wretched victims of moral and physical disease.—RENDALL.

‘Devil.’—τοῦ διαβόλου. This name which occurs but twice in Acts, originally means a false accuser, and is specially applied to Satan as the great adversary of our race.—ALEXANDER.

‘For God was with Him.’—In this verse we have the three Persons in the Blessed Trinity.—COOK.

A COMMENT meant to bring home to Gentiles the significance of Christ’s deeds of power.—BARTLET.

THE SERMON.

The Spirit in the Son of Man.

By the Rev. T. G. Selby.

How difficult we find it to realize that the Spirit was imperative not only to man with inbred sin, but also to the Son of Man, with all His inherent virtue and power. In His humanity He needed the Great Sanctifier to show that goodness, even in Him, was not self-originated. He needed the inward leading, the stimulating force through all His earthly life, and He received it from the Father in full measure.

The early beginnings of this wonderful life were implanted in the Virgin Mother by an act of the Holy Ghost. He was present there as a creative and dominating force, and so wrought and ruled that the life was protected against all the frailties of an earthly lineage. In the early years of the Lord Jesus there was, no doubt, implicit dependence on the inward leading of the Spirit, and this it was made Him so entirely acceptable to God. Then when the time for His public ministry came—when He was baptized in the river Jordan—the Spirit descended upon Him again. It was not enough that thirty years before He had conveyed the properties of a mystic divinity to those natural elements out of which the child had been shaped. Notwithstanding His glorious past, this Prophet who had come down from Heaven, needed the Spirit to bring new anointings and prerogatives, to be a vehicle of new visions and new powers. It was the Spirit who led up the newly baptized prophet to His temptation, assured of His moral fitness to bear the awful strain. There was no spirit of self-sufficiency in Him as in the case of Simon Peter, nor any confronting of temptation in a spirit of recklessness as so often in our own case.

The Spirit seems to have been a great compensating factor in the life of our Lord. Before the Incarnation He had indeed emptied Himself of His eternal wisdom, but the Spirit restored by secret inspirations what He had not seen fit to grasp; He had renounced His power, but all His wonderful works show the energies of the attending spirit; He gave up His glory, but He had the Dove of Peace ever with Him to comfort and gladden.

The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews tells us that it was by 'the eternal Spirit Christ offered

Himself without spot to God,' so we have the presence and power of the Spirit revealed again in the great act of sacrifice. No human witness found any self-seeking or boastfulness or murmuring to vitiate the sacrifice, nor did the Eternal Witness who had companied with Him all His life.

If the Spirit was given to Christ so fully as the Head and Pattern of humanity, all who become true members of His body may share the same spirit in unstinted measure. Will not the pitiful Father, who gave to His Son so lavishly, give in like measure to His Son's disciples whose needs are so deep and manifold?

Sympathy in Action.

By the Rev. H. W. Horwill, M.A.

There are many devout people who, hating the wickedness of this world, have withdrawn to some lonely spot with the determination to spend their lives there, solitary and alone. In the world their brothers may be struggling and fighting, but they heed them not, and yet they say that their lives are an imitation of Christ—of Him who went about doing good.

Opposed to these ascetics are the strict Protestants who spend six days bartering and selling, and on the seventh make their way to church to pay their duty to God. They are comfortable, and listen with satisfaction to the words of the preacher. They sit still, *feeling* good. Neither is it sufficient to talk good, to intersperse our conversation with scriptural quotations, or to speak the dialect of Canaan. Jesus spoke much, yet His words were never empty, and now His followers must not only say, 'Depart in peace, be ye warmed and filled,' they must struggle and work so that others may be filled.

Christ went about doing good in two ways: (1) He did good to men's souls. No one who came to Him was repulsed, many who did not come were sought out. Christ came not only to save, but also to seek. In these words, however, Peter probably refers to the other way in which Christ did good.

(2) He did good to men's bodies. This spirit of Christ has breathed in His followers; for even when we admit much of what has been said about the selfishness of the church, it is true that nine-tenths of the efforts made for the good of the

bodies of men owe their origin to Christianity. Humanity is a word unknown to Plato or Aristotle. Hospitals and orphanages were unheard of before the coming of Christ. Constantly do we hear the argument that as much good is done by non-Christians as by Christians. But surely it is not so. Where will you find atheistic medical missions or shelters? Where among atheists people who have done so much for their fellowmen as Barnardo, Florence Nightingale, or Sister Dora?

For us all there are many ways of doing good. Indiscriminate almsgiving is not one. Christ's feeding of the multitude has been sometimes used to defend reckless almsgiving, but it is not a parallel. He fed the multitude because they were too far from a village to buy food. We are nowhere told that they had not money to buy the food.

In this democratic age we have the power of doing good to a whole population, and our instrument is an Act of Parliament. We can agitate for the closing of the public houses, for the reform of the poor laws, the better housing of the working classes, and the destruction of the sweating system. And the motive which should inspire us in all our work is love. 'We love,' not Him, but the whole world 'because He first loved us.'

ILLUSTRATIONS.

Anointed with the Holy Ghost.—Mr. Charles Finney, the celebrated evangelist, in his autobiography, tells the following as his experience very soon after his conversion:—'As I turned, and was about to take a seat by the fire, I received a mighty baptism of the Holy Ghost. Without any expectation of it, without ever having the thought in my mind that there was any such thing for me, without any recollection that I had ever heard the thing mentioned by any person in the world, the Holy Ghost descended upon me in a manner that seemed to go through me, body and soul. I could feel the impression like a wave of electricity, going through and through me. Indeed, it seemed to come in waves and waves of liquid love, for I could not express it in any other way. It seemed like the very breath of God. I can recollect distinctly that it seemed to fan me like immense wings. No words can express the wonderful love that was shed abroad in my heart. I wept aloud with joy and love. . . . These waves came over me and over me and over me, one after the other, until I recollect I cried out, "I shall die if these waves continue to pass over me." I said, "Lord, I cannot bear any more"; yet I had no fear of death.'—J. F. B. TINLING.

Who went about doing good.—A policeman in Glasgow saw a poor woman pick up something from the street, quickly

put it in her apron, and then hurry on. Thinking it was something valuable, he went up and asked her what it was she was concealing. The woman was very confused, and would not answer him for a time, and that, of course, only confirmed his suspicions. But at last she opened her apron, and what was there?—only a few pieces of broken glass. The important policeman felt, of course, a little crestfallen. Her explanation, however, was very touching. 'I thought,' she said, looking at the bits of broken glass, 'that I would take them out of the way of the bairns' feet.'—J. ELLIS.

'RELIGION,' I said; for, properly speaking, all true work is religion; and whatsoever religion is not work may go and dwell among the Brahmins, Antinomians, Spinning Dervishes, or where it will; with me it shall have no harbour. Admirable was that of the old monks, '*Laborare est orare*'—'Work is worship.'—THOMAS CARLYLE.

WOULDEST thou see the skies aglow?

Work, work untiring;
Do the will, and thou shalt know
Doctrines soul-inspiring;
Do the will through fire and flood,
On life's claims attendant,
And in price of Calvary's blood
Heaven shall shine resplendent.

Wouldst thou see through gates ajar
Bright, bright God's beauty?
Wait not thou for sun nor star;
Do thy present duty.
Duty's path may thorny be,
Steep, steep her climbing,
But, upon her hill-top free,
Sabbath bells are chiming.

GEORGE MATHESON.

For God was with Him.—There is a touching fact recorded in connexion with the battle of Prestonpans. Seeing their chief fall, wounded by two balls, a Highland regiment wavered. But their wounded leader raised himself on his elbow, and cried, 'I am not dead, my children, but am looking at you to see you do your duty.' There was a charm in the fact that they still fought under the eye of their beloved chief. It called forth their mightiest energies; and they did all that men could do to turn and stem the tide of battle.—A. C. PRICE.

MAN'S life is but a working day

Whose tasks are set aright:

A time to work, a time to pray,

And then a quiet night.

And then, please God, a quiet night,

Where palms are green and robes are white;

A long-drawn breath, a balm for sorrow,

And all things lovely on the morrow.

CHRISTINA ROSSETTI.

FOR REFERENCE.

Alexander (W.), *Leading Ideas of the Gospels*, 4.
 Dawson (G.), *The Authentic Gospel*, 17.
 Hort (F. J. A.), *Romans and Ephesians*, 205, 217.
 Horwill (H. W.), *The Old Gospel in the New Era*, 195.
 Jowett (B.), *College Sermons*, vol. ii. 309.
 Morison (J.), *Saving Faith*, 448.

Oosterzee (J. J. van), *Year of Salvation*, vol. ii.
 Price (A. C.), *Flowers and Bible Trees*, 49.
 Reeve (J. W.), *Forty-two Sermons*, 139.
 Salmond (C. A.), *For Days of Youth*, 148.
 Selby (T. G.), *The Holy Spirit and Christian Privilege*, 25.
 Spurgeon (C. H.), *Evening by Evening*.
 Spurgeon (C. H.), *The Messiah*, 363.
 Vallings (J. F.), *The Holy Spirit of Promise*, 83.

Recent Biblical and Oriental Archaeology.

BY PROFESSOR A. H. SAYCE, D.D., LL.D., OXFORD.

A New Exploration Society.

A NEW Society has just come into existence for the exploration of the East. This is 'Die Deutsche Gesellschaft für die wissenschaftliche Erforschung Anatoliens,' the object of which is to do for Asia Minor what the Palestine Exploration Fund is doing for the Holy Land or the Egypt Exploration Fund for Egypt. Hardly had it been founded when its first president, the veteran Virchow, died, but his place has been worthily supplied by Dr. Belck, the well-known traveller and explorer in Armenia and the Hittite region. A great and almost untouched field of research lies before the new Society. It is to Asia Minor that we must look for the answers to some of the chief problems of Oriental and Greek archæology, and the importance of Asia Minor to the student of the Old Testament, and still more of the New, is becoming every day more recognized. Professor Ramsay has shown what a flood of light the Greek inscriptions of Asia Minor cast upon the early history of Christianity, and the records of the Hittite tribes who once exercised so profound an influence upon Palestine, lie buried in the mounds of its ruined cities. It was time that scientific exploration should turn to Asia Minor, the link and bridge, as it were, between the ancient cultures of the East and West.

The primary purposes of the new Society are stated to be 'the discovery of Asianic antiquities, more especially in Anatolia and adjoining countries; the extension of a knowledge of the results of these discoveries by means of publications; and the awakening of an interest in the investigation of early Asiatic civilization.' Membership can be obtained by a yearly subscription of £1 or a donation of £25.

The Society has already justified its existence by the publication of two papers. The first is an introductory article by Dr. Lohmann, entitled 'Probleme der Orientforschung,' which is well written and interesting. It contains photographs of one of the Hittite cuneiform tablets found by Dr. Belck at Boghaz Keui; of the great Hittite stela of Bogtscha, discovered by the same explorer; of the Hittite obelisk of Palanga; and of the Hittite inscription of Agrak, which allows us at last to read the text. I should translate it: 'Sanda-yaeghas the powerful king, lord of the land, priest of Amma, who has made for the people of the city of . . .' Dr. Lohmann has also given a selected list of the Hittite characters which I have deciphered, as well as some interesting geographical identifications.

The second publication of the Society is by Dr. Belck, on the bilingual Vannic and Assyrian inscription of Keli-shin discovered by himself and Dr. Lehmann, and it forms the first instalment of the Society's *Journal*. The inscription is a very important one, not only on account of its bilingual character, but also for historical reasons. It gives us the native proto-Armenian version of the campaign of Sargon against Muzazir, and shows that the account of it given by the Assyrian monarch was not accepted by his adversaries.

Oettli on Khammurabi.

Another little book on the relation of the newly discovered Code of Khammurabi to the Law of Israel has been published, under the title of *Das Gesetz Hammurabis und die Thora Israels* (Leipzig: Deichert, 1903), by Professor Oettli. It traverses much the same ground as the work of Dr. Johannes

Jeremias already reviewed in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, and treats the subject from much the same point of view. Like myself, Professor Oettli is struck rather by the contrast between the codes of Babylonia and Israel than by their agreement. As he remarks, what parallels exist between them are to be found on the Israelitish side chiefly in the Book of the Covenant, to a less extent in Deuteronomy, and least of all in the Priestly Codex. For this, however, there is a good reason. The ritual Codex of Babylonia has not yet been dis-

covered, and it is with the ritual law that the Priestly Codex is pre-eminently concerned. The arrangement of Professor Oettli's book is clear and easy to follow.

Queen Hatshepsu.

The burial-chamber of the tomb of queen Hatshepsu at Thebes has just been discovered, with the sarcophagi of the queen and of her father, Thothmes I. The mummy of the queen, however, has not yet been found.

Contributions to the Greek Testament.

BY PROFESSOR EBERHARD NESTLE, D.D.; MAULBRONN.

NOTE ON LUKE ix. 57-61.

AN important religious lesson is to be learned from a minute difference of spelling in these verses. One set of editions prints *Κύριε* (with a capital K), the other *κύριε*; among the latter are some in which the custom is followed to print the word where it refers to God and Christ with a capital K.

Compare on the one hand Mill, on the other Lloyd's reprint of Mill and the editions of the B.F.B.S. Scrivener is divided. In his reprint of Stephen's text of 1550 he gives *κύριε*; in his edition 'according to the text followed in the A.V. together with the variations adopted in the R.V.,' *Κύριε*. The latter is based on Beza's text of 1598. Scrivener, who noted in Ac 27¹⁷ the difference of spelling between *σύρτυν* and *Σύρτυν*, and Hoskier, who noted also that between *κέδρων* and *Κέδρων* (see *A full Account*, App. B. pp. 6, 14, App. C. p. 20), both fail to call attention to this variation. I have verified the passages in the original editions of 1550 (Stephanus), 1598 (Beza), 1707 (Mill). All have both times *Κύριε* with a capital. In Lk 23⁴² Scrivener's reprint of 1550 gives (with the original) *Κύριε*, but 19⁸ *κύριε*, where the original has *Κύριε*. Here the capital K seems even more justified than in 9⁵⁷⁻⁶¹.

A comparison of the Gospels gave the following results:—

Stephens (1550) printed *Κύριος* (capital): Mt 13⁵¹
15²²⁻²⁷ 16²² 20^{80, 81} 22^{43, 44, 45} 24⁴² 26²², Mk
11³, Lk 5⁸ 6⁴⁶ 9⁵⁷⁻⁶¹ 10² 17^{37 (=38)} 19⁸ 20⁴⁴,
Jn 8¹¹.

Beza (1598) put a small initial in two passages:
Mt 24⁴² 26²².

Mill (1707) also in two: Mt 15²⁷, Lk 10².

Lloyd (1828) and Scrivener have a small initial in all these passages, except that in the latest reprint of Lloyd (1889) the capital K has been restored in Lk 19⁸, but not in 9⁵⁷⁻⁶¹, nor in any other of the passages above mentioned. Scrivener restored the capital K in the so-called *editio maior* of 1886 in Lk 5⁸ 6⁴⁶ 9⁵⁷ (not ⁶¹) Jn 8¹¹.

Most curious is the case in the parallel passages: Mt 21³ = Mk 11³ = Lk 19³¹⁻³⁴. Here Stephens, Beza, Mill have everywhere capitals; Lloyd and Bible Society only in Matthew, Scrivener in Matthew and Luke.

Similar is the case in Mt 22^{43, 44, 45} = Mk 12^{36, 37} = Lk 20⁴²⁻⁴⁴.

Here already Stephens had a small initial in Matthew twice, in Luke once (not ⁴⁴); Beza and Mill in Matthew once (not ³⁶); Lloyd and Scrivener have it everywhere. Small initials are found in Stephens, also in Mt 15²⁷, Mk 7²⁸.

If the principle be maintained to distinguish between *κύριος* and *Κύριος*, it is difficult to see the reason in most of the twenty-one passages why K was given up by Lloyd and Scrivener.

Very interesting, further, is the comparison between the *Κύριε* in the mouth of the apostles (Mt 26²²) and the *παββί* of Judas Iscariot in v. ²⁵.

The R.V. noted the difference of translation, *Sir* or *Lord*, in Jn 4^{11, 19, 49} 5⁷. An article on this

use of 'Sir' in the Bible would have been welcome in the *Dictionary of the Bible*.

In the parable Lk 19, the R.V. prints v.¹⁸, 'Thy pound, Lord,' and both Palmer and Scrivener give in the corresponding Greek, Ἡ μὲν σου, Κύριε. I do not know whether these capitals L and K are intentional, or the consequence of the fact that in the earlier texts 'Lord' and Κύριε stood at the beginning of the sentence. We must not be content to say to Christ κύριε, nor even Κύριε, in the sense of Mt 7^{21, 22}; He must become, in reality, our κύριος and Κύριος.

THE NEW GREEK TESTAMENT OF THE BIBLE SOCIETY.

There are two editions of the Greek Testament which have been published by the British and Foreign Bible Society in connexion with its Centenary—one which contains nothing but the text, the other which has marginal references and a critical apparatus. On the former nothing need be said. The text is that which was first published in 1898 by the Württembergian Bible Society at Stuttgart, based on a comparison of the recensions of Tischendorf, Westcott-Hort, and Weymouth, the latter being replaced afterwards by that of Bernhard Weiss. Only the square brackets [] of that edition have been removed, except in certain cases, as Lk 24^{12, 36}, etc.

The principal edition is the annotated, which gives in its apparatus a comparison of the new text—(1) with the Textus Receptus, and (2) with the Greek text that underlies the Revised Version. As the Revisers state in their preface: 'A revision of the Greek text was the necessary foundation of our work; but it did not fall within our province to construct a continuous and complete Greek text.' In many cases the English rendering was considered to represent correctly either of two competing readings in the Greek, and then the question of the text was usually not raised. But for various readings, which might properly affect the translation, they had to decide between their rival claims, and these decisions have been published by the University Presses in connexion with complete Greek texts of the New Testament. Cambridge published, under the care of F. H. A. SCRIVENER, the text followed in the A.V., with the variations adopted in the R.V. in the margin; Oxford, *vice versa*, under the care of

Archdeacon PALMER, put the readings adopted by the Revisers in the text, referring the readings of the A.V. to the margin. Only SCRIVENER's edition had to be consulted, the more so as he kept the record for the N.T. Revision Company of the readings which it adopted, and prepared the list of these readings, which was communicated to the University Presses. SCRIVENER's edition (used in a copy of *The Parallel New Testament, Greek and English*, 1892) shows about 5600 marginal notes, Palmer's about 5250. These had to be compared with the new text. The figures below will show how closely both agree. Then the English text of the R.V. had to be compared with the new Greek text, to infer any Greek readings followed by the Revisers which might deviate from the new text. This comparison has been made twice, beside some assistance given by Mr. Sewell, to ensure greater accuracy, and these 'inferential readings' are marked with a different mark (clarendon **R**) to distinguish them from those which the Revisers expressly fixed as their Greek text. The inferential readings were found frequently to agree with the Received Text. No account is made of them in the following list. Finally, the marginal notes of the R.V. had to be attended to, where they presupposed a different reading and did not give only a different translation of an identical text. Frequently these marginal notes affected the punctuation or spelling (for instance, κύριος and Κύριος = *sir* and *Lord*, πνεῦμα and Πνεῦμα, the latter reserved for the Holy Spirit; compare Ph 1²⁷ 'stand fast in one spirit' = mind, with 2 Co 12¹⁸ 'we walked by the same Spirit' = Holy Ghost). One of the nicest examples of this kind is the inscription of the altar at Athens, Ac 17²³, 'to an unknown god' or 'to the unknown God,' though here the capital types used in the R.V. do not express this difference as in other places. Variations touching the punctuation and interpretation are put into brackets; they are most frequently in the Epistles of Paul, and had not found sufficient attention in previous editions. Compare, for instance, 1 Ti 2¹ A.V., 'I exhort therefore, that, first of all, supplications . . . be made'; R.V., 'I exhort therefore, first of all, that supplications . . .'

A glance through the book will at once show that some parts are crowded with variations, while others have very few. No page is quite free from variation; but see in the Gospels, Mt 10^{34ff.} (ten verses without any variation); in the Epistles,

Ro 5¹⁵⁻⁶¹⁰ (one marginal reading of the Revisers, one variant of T.R.), or Gal 1²⁰⁻²¹⁰, Ph 4⁴⁻¹⁸. The greatest number of variations is found in the Second Gospel and in the last book of the N.T. This has a very simple explanation.

When ERASMUS printed his N.T. in 1516, he had for Revelation but one MS. at his disposal, which was partially defective and not always correctly read by him. His errors have been transmitted through the T.R. into our days. The Revisers could not allow them to pass without change, just as they had been corrected before in the recensions of Tischendorf and others. Hence the great number of variants.¹

¹ By way of comparison I can give the number of variants in SCRIVENER'S so-called *Editio Maior*. He compared BEZA, ELZEVIR, LACHMANN, TISCHENDORF, TREGELLES, WESTCOTT-HORT, and the REVISERS with STEPHEN'S text of 1550, and noted even orthographical variants, which are neglected in my comparison. I counted in his edition 12,125 notes. It is a very conscientious work; nevertheless, I found some omissions and misstatements when I used it to check my own collations; compare, for instance, He 10¹, where it is stated that W.H. have *als* instead of *ās*, or Ja 4^g, where the reading *ἐγγλωσσε* of W.H. is missing, etc.

In the case of the Second Gospel the reason is different. Here the variations arose in very early times, when the N.T. as a whole began to be transmitted by handwriting. Then copyists were tempted to assimilate the text of the Second Gospel to that of the First, which was better known. Already Jerome complains that this was one of the chief causes of textual corruption in his days. The critical editions restored the original text, and the Revisers, following them, were forced to deviate from the T.R. more frequently in this Gospel than in the First or the Fourth. But the table given below will speak for itself. Full exactness of figures is not aimed at, especially in columns 2 and 3, but the figures will be sufficiently accurate.

The first column gives the number of verses (counted on the English Bible). There are differences of numbering in different editions: Jn 1, for instance, has 51 or 52 verses, Ac 19 has 40 or 41, 24 has 28 or 27, 2 Co 13 has 14 or 13, Philem 23 or 25, 3 Jn 14 or 15, Rev 2 17 or 18 verses.

The second, the number of marginal notes in

	1. Verses.	2. Marginal Notes in SCRIVENER.	3. Marginal Notes in New Edition of B. & F. B. S.	4. 5. 6. Marginal Notes from—			7. Total of R.V. (4-6).
				R.V. Text.	R.V. Marg.	R.V. Greek.	
St. Matthew	1071	475	885	24	45	10	79
St. Mark	678	675	920	25	27	16	68
St. Luke	1151	864	1263	16	56	35	107
St. John	878	551	573	18	34	22	74
Acts	1007	804	1165	14	37	12	63
Romans	433	194	275	12	35	3	50
1 Corinthians	437	291	371	20	16	5	41
2 Corinthians	257	166	211	8	11	10	29
Galatians	149	65	96	4	3	1	8
Ephesians	155	94	117	5	7	2	14
Philippians	104	58	69	2	7	1	10
Colossians	95	73	94	7	15	2	24
1 Thessalonians	89	57	72	1	8	0	9
2 Thessalonians	47	30	36	2	3	0	5
1 Timothy	113	53	62	0	3	1	4
2 Timothy	83	40	52	4	3	1	8
Titus	46	24	34	1	3	0	4
Philemon	25	19	23	4	0	1	5
Hebrews	303	153	183	10	12	1	23
James	108	65	97	5	10	0	15
1 Peter	105	80	98	4	6	1	11
2 Peter	61	41	54	4	4	2	10
1 John	105	57	74	2	6	0	8
2 John	13	12	17	1	1	1	3
3 John	14	11	14	1	0	0	1
Jude	25	25	31	2	2	5	9
Revelation	404	641	699	15	36	24	75
Total	7956	5618	7585	211	390	156	757

Scrivener's comparison of the Greek text underlying the A.V. with that of the R.V. (*Parallel New Testament*, see above).

The third, the numbers of marginal notes on the new edition of the Bible Society.

Columns 4-7 give the notes from the R.V.—4 from its text, 5 from its margin, 6 the Greek readings fixed by the Revisers (see above), 7 the total of 4-6.

If the new edition will be found tolerably free from misprints, the merit is due, in the first instance, to the skill of the workmen and to the care of the readers of the Cambridge University Press, where the book has been printed.

It is not the intention of these lines to call attention to particular readings of the old or the new text. Only one example may be quoted to show how the position or omission of a comma

makes quite a different construction. Ac 27³⁹, the A.V. has, 'into which they were minded, if it were possible, to thrust in the ship'; the R.V. put 'they took counsel whether they could drive the ship upon it.' The A.V. construed ἐβουλεύσαντο with *infinitive* and took εἰ δύναιτο as conditional clause; the R.V. made εἰ dependent on ἐβουλεύσαντο and the infinitive on δύναιτο. No German commentary or translation known to me has ever thought of this possibility, which seems to me the better construction, and both SCRIVENER and PALMER failed to call attention to this difference between A.V. and R.V. In the text of Palmer the, after δύναιτο must be deleted; in the edition of Scrivener a marginal note must be added. It surely pays itself to compare most carefully the R.V. with the Greek, and the new edition will prove a convenient help for this purpose.

At the Literary Table.

THE LIFE OF FARRAR.

THE LIFE OF FREDERIC WILLIAM FARRAR.

By his son, Reginald Farrar. (*Nisbet*.
6s. net.)

FARRAR was more to the world than to the Church. And that was because he was less of the world than most Churchmen are. His son admits that 'his work was often the subject of criticism.' There is apology in the admission where there should be pride. If he had been less a man and more a Churchman he would have been little criticised. It is the business of men who are men as well as Churchmen to lead the Church forward, not to smile and say all is well; and the leader is always criticised.

Mr. Farrar was alive to the criticism when he undertook to write his father's life. So he has made the life an apology. And the apology, wisely, is written by other men. It is contained in letters and the like. We are glad to see those letters. But they were not needed. No apology was needed. That many men and probably yet more women were saved from spiritual disaster by Farrar, by the very things for which he was so severely criticised, we had no doubt whatever. That the world was altogether a sweeter and more hopeful place to live in because he had lived in it, we had no doubt whatever.

It was not his opinions that saved or sweetened. It was the courage with which he uttered them. It was the man who held the opinions. It is probable that the causes for which he stood—they were chiefly temperance and eternal hope—gained considerably by his advocacy of them. But it was not through the arguments he used. It was by the way he told on the heart. He had a moral, more than an intellectual, hold of his contemporaries. He used words that burned like fire, not words that merely gave clear light.

He was criticised. His son feels it. He feels it too keenly to refer often to it. But once he is very bold and quotes a letter. This is the letter—

'SIR,—If your sermon has been correctly reported in the *John Bull*, which you preached last Sunday afternoon in Westminster Abbey, in which you boldly denied the doctrine of eternal punishment, which is distinctly taught in the Church of England, as well as in the Word of God, for the Church teaches nothing contrary to God's word: you will, of course, if you are an honest man, secede from that Church as I believe Sir Samuel Minton has done. You may be a theologian, but I fear that you have never been taught by God's Spirit, or you would not preach such a soul-destroying error as that which you preached last Sunday, if the report be a correct one. Look, for instance, at one passage, out of multitudes that can be adduced, Rev. xx. 10: "And the devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and false prophet are;

and shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever." Then read the 22nd chapter, verses 18, 19, and you may well tremble. I think that your position as a clergyman is a most fearful one, and I pray that your eyes may be opened to see your danger before it be too late, and you find yourself in the lake of unquenchable fire.—I am, Sir, yours faithfully,
A STUDENT OF GOD'S WORD.

THE PROTESTANT DICTIONARY.

A PROTESTANT DICTIONARY. Edited by the Rev. Charles H. H. Wright, D.D., and the Rev. Charles Neil, M.A. (*Hodder & Stoughton*. 8vo, pp. xv, 832. 15s. net.)

We should have preferred the title 'A Dictionary of Protestantism,' but that is a small matter. It is a scholarly book, it is almost ostentatiously Protestant, but it gives good reasons for its Protestantism. Among the writers are Mr. F. C. Conybeare of Oxford, Professor Cowan of Aberdeen, Mrs. Dunlop Gibson of Cambridge, Dr. Gordon Gray of Rome, Professor Herkless of St. Andrews, Thomas Hodgkin, Principal Lindsay of Glasgow, Dr. Mackennal, Professor Margoliouth and Mrs. Margoliouth of Oxford, the Bishop of Durham, Professor Nicol of Aberdeen, Professor Orr of Glasgow, Professor Peake of Manchester, the late Dr. Salmon of Dublin, Mr. Thatcher of Mansfield College, and the Dean of Canterbury.

It must not be supposed that the articles are confined to the controversy with Rome. It is a dictionary of the Church according to the Protestant faith. That is to say, all the great doctrines are described, but they are described in such a way as to expose whatever Romish error has crept into them; all the vestments are described (and figured as well, some on beautiful plate paper), but their true Catholic character is separated from their merely Roman Catholic; and so with all the rest.

On the whole, the only fault is brevity. The articles should often have been fuller. The risk of excessive shortness is generality. Statements are made of the most sweeping kind, which the writer never means as *ipse dixit*, but which he has no space to qualify or substantiate. Nevertheless, it is a valuable book. Perhaps its brevity will give it the greater circulation. If it does circulate it will open some eyes and stir some consciences. The writers are alive to the uselessness and the needlessness of over-strong language, for they believe that the Protestant is

the most ancient faith, and that it will be the most lasting.

CHINA PAST AND PRESENT.

CHINA PAST AND PRESENT. By Edward Harper Parker. (*Chapman & Hall*. 8vo, pp. 424. 10s. 6d. net.)

China is a large country. It was no light undertaking to set out to describe it in a single volume. And China past and present! Professor Parker does not let burdens lie heavily on him. His style is light-hearted like himself. If we have not a complete history of China past and present, we have a book of most racy reading about China. It is the modern appetite,—the appetite that crowds the booksellers' counters with 'Strands' and 'Windsors' and 'Royals,'—not pandered to, but met and tickled and lifted just a little to higher things.

Professor Harper touches religion with as light a hand as everything else. It is the side of religion that appeals to the man in the street, its seamy side for the most part, with never a word of contempt, however.

The curious thing is that all this banter and buoyancy reveals the fact that life in China, even diplomatic life, is not a screaming farce, but a mighty reality. It is serious, and succeeds by its seriousness. The forms, especially the diplomatic forms, are utterly ridiculous to the European; but the ridiculous forms are an essential part of the serious life the Chinese live. They are not ridiculous to them, they are the body which the soul of all intercourse clothes itself in, and the soul cannot be without the body, at least not in China.

Well, we have our red-tape, too. What a pity it is that Britons insist on using only their own particular colour of tape and sealing-wax. Professor Parker's chapter on 'The Way China is Governed' is a fine example of the humour that incongruity furnishes, but the Chinaman is probably moved to laughter when he comes to know how Britain is governed. One thing above all others does Professor Parker make clear, that China will never be managed by the officials in our Foreign Office.

THE JEWISH ENCYCLOPEDIA.

THE JEWISH ENCYCLOPEDIA. Edited by Isidore Singer, Ph.D., and others. (*Funk & Wagnalls*. Vol. vi. GOD—ISTRIA.)

There is no subject of the first importance in

the sixth volume. The most likely is the subject with which the volume opens, and GOD is dealt with in five articles. But they are all by one hand, and they are all very short. This is almost a lost opportunity. Dr. Davidson has said that the Old Testament speaks but one word, and that word is GOD. It was a rare privilege the editors of the *Jewish Encyclopedia* had, to gather together the revelation of God scattered through the Old Testament, and then draw out the advance upon that revelation which has been made by the Talmud, if there is advance. A comparative estimate in detail of the God of the Hebrews and the God of the Jews (to use the words conventionally) would have been of inestimable value. The God of philosophy and the rest we should have been content to look for elsewhere.

Nevertheless, the articles are well done. If Professor Hirsch has been confined, he has made excellent use of his limits. And it must be an extremely difficult thing to apportion the space over so vast an area and through such a variety of work.

The biographical work in this volume is especially useful. One of the earliest (after the thicket of Goldschmidts, Goldsmids, and Goldsmiths is past) is Professor Ignaz Goldziher of Budapest, the greatest living authority on Muhammadanism. It seems that he is little more than fifty years of age. A favourable view is taken of the conversion to Judaism of Lord George Gordon. The marks of a sincere believer were upon him. 'During his stay in Newgate, he conformed strictly in all respects to the Jewish religion, eating Kasher meat and wearing phylacteries.' On the whole, however, the effort to 'take no side' is well maintained throughout the *Encyclopedia*. It is seen conspicuously in the notice of Graetz, the historian of the Jews, a difficult subject, which has been cleverly handled by Professor Deutsch of Cincinnati.

Passing through the book we notice a careful article by Professor Bacher on Hebrew Grammar, and a convenient summary of what Hellenism stands for, by the late Professor Siegfried of Jena and Professor Richard Gottheil of New York. The longest article in the book seems to be that on the INQUISITION. There also, there is the determination to 'take no side'; but the purely historical narrative is more terrible reading than a declamatory style would have been.

THE TREE IN THE MIDST.

THE TREE IN THE MIDST. By Greville Macdonald, M.D. (Hodder & Stoughton. 10s. 6d. net.)

'We now come to the main argument up to which we were climbing. Its purport is to show, in manner as certain as is possible when dealing with abstract ideas, that the evolution of man consists in a perpetual freeing of himself and his race from the environmental restrictions which, in a lower state, had been necessary to his existence. In presenting this idea I shall have recourse to the old biblical legend of the Creation, because it affords a good illustration of one point which we shall understand is essential to all growth. This illustration is the Tree in the Midst of the Garden of Eden, the fruit of which, though declared to be wholesome, and, indeed, necessary to Adam's enlargement, he was forbidden to eat. And I shall point out how, in his act of insubordination, he found freedom from the stagnation involved in obedience to rigid convention.'

This does not sound very orthodox. Dr. Macdonald has no great consideration for orthodoxy. He holds that there are two antichrists in the world at present—the orthodox man and the materialist. And although his express purpose is to answer and end the materialistic antichrist, he can do nothing without treading constantly on the other. Does he thus offend both sides? He does. But the world is no longer divided between the religious majority and materialism. Dr. Macdonald counts now—for has not his father lived before him?—upon a hearing from a goodly multitude that stands between. And he hopes to make that multitude greater.

His argument is against materialism. He believes in modern physical science: he refuses only to fall down and worship it. He believes in evolution; he refuses only to call it aimless and blind. There is a Divinity that shapes our ends, and we can love Him. The secret of man is in his heart. He can love. That answers all the materialistic arguments. It demands freedom of the will. And when the freedom of the will is granted, the door may be opened to the long, long history of folly and sin in the world, but it is also made open to the entrance of the new Man; and it is shut to materialism. 'When we assert the unquestionable reality of free-will, we do not say that

man can act without motive, but that he has the power of choosing which of two or more forces shall rule his actions.' That is enough. There is no room for materialism there. There is room for everlasting life, as well as the worm that dieth not.

OUTLINES OF PASTORAL THEOLOGY.

Translated and Edited by the late W. Hastie, D.D. (*T. & T. Clark*. Crown 8vo, pp. xiv, 78. 1s. 6d. net).—How Professor Hastie discovered this book and how he was drawn to it, how it had to be laid aside and how it would not lie,—all this is told with thrilling simplicity in the Introduction. The book is all that Professor Hastie found it. We do greatly need a small competent sympathetic guide to the work of the Ministry. This is the book we need.

THE WORLD'S EPOCH-MAKERS. DESCARTES, SPINOZA, AND THE NEW PHILOSOPHY. By James Iverach, M.A., D.D. (*T. & T. Clark*. Crown 8vo, pp. xii, 245. 3s.).—Few men in our day are so well equipped for work of this kind as Professor Iverach. He has read till he thinks in the language of philosophy, yet when he has to write for the man in the street he can transmute the jargon into limpid Anglo-Saxon. It is true he does not always do so. Sometimes he retains a rumble of words and sentences as if to show what the task of transmutation involves. In this volume he is nearly always lucid and simple. He moves on from problem to problem with a giant's ease. He makes it manifest, too, that Descartes and Spinoza were of the world's epoch-makers.

NEW LIGHT ON THE LIFE OF JESUS.

By Charles Augustus Briggs, D.D., D.Litt. (*T. & T. Clark*. 8vo, pp. xiv, 196. 4s. 6d. net).—Three of the essays which make up this handsome volume were published in *THE EXPOSITORY TIMES*, and attracted much attention. For Professor Briggs announced a great fertile discovery in them. He now reveals the whole wide-ranging influence of that discovery. And it is easy to say that no writer or preacher on the Life of Christ will know his work if he does not take Dr. Briggs into account. As Professor Briggs says, 'The new light solves most of the difficult problems of the Gospels, fills up the chasm between the Synoptics

and the Gospel of John, and satisfies the most searching inquiries of modern Higher Criticism and Historical Criticism.'

PRACTICAL POINTS IN POPULAR

PROVERBS. By F. A. Rees (*Baptist Union*. Crown 8vo., pp. 152. 2s. 6d.).—Mr. Rees turns our common sayings to useful ethical purpose, and withal in a very pithy, pointed manner. Perhaps the ethical interest is not the deepest in his mind. There are few pages that do not discover the name of our Saviour somewhere. But it is not that the moral shades into the spiritual, it is itself spiritual. It is faith working by love in the smallest matters of daily life.

THE DISCIPLINE OF FAITH. By Darwell Stone, M.A. (*Brown*. Crown 8vo, pp. 198. 3s. 6d.).

The title seems to be taken from the second sermon, of which the text is, 'Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day; and he saw it, and was glad.' That sermon was preached on behalf of the Association for Promoting the Unity of Christendom. One can understand how Abraham was disciplined through the demand made on him to see afar off; one can understand how the bickerings and jealousies and all the divisions of our day demand the same far vision and afford the same spiritual discipline. This is Mr. Stone's method always. The past is the present, the present is the past. Man, as well as God, is the same yesterday and to-day and for ever. Faith is ever there, discipline is ever through faith. And Abraham, except for ruder ideas of God, is Darwell Stone. Except for ruder ideas of God, we say; for that is the one line along which the race has made progress. That is why you can take Abraham into a modern 'retreat,' and urge the discipline of faith by his example. That is why our Lord could say, 'Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day; and he saw it, and was glad.'

THE TEACHING OF JESUS. By George

Jackson, B.A. (*Hodder & Stoughton*. Crown 8vo, pp. xii, 252. 3s. 6d.).—This is not a theologian's systematic treatise on the teaching of our Lord, it is a preacher's interpretation, pressed home under the abiding sense that the words He speaks unto us they are spirit and they are life. Mr. Jackson has the gift of directness. He gets

at the heart of his subject, he gets at the heart of his hearer. He does both surely and swiftly. And yet it is not a book to be picked up like the newspaper, scanned, and left. It touches the conscience. It is able almost to create a conscience, so real and direct are its appeals to the man within us that might have been. We say that Jesus did not come to speak, that He came to do, and it is so. But this teaching is doing; the baptism that He has to be baptized with gives the words their flash of revelation. We see the Cross in the Sermon on the Mount. That is the great success of Mr. Jackson's *Teaching of Jesus*.

THE MAID OF SHULAM. By Hugh Falconer, B.D. (*Hodder & Stoughton*. Crown 8vo, pp. 167. 3s. 6d.).—If Mr. Falconer should succeed in recovering a lost book of the Bible, his reward will be great. He makes a brave attempt. He knows that the Song of Songs cannot be restored to us on the old lines of the purely allegorical interpretation. He knows also that the modern way of finding in the Song a series of beautiful folk-lyrics is no recovery at all, however passionate and however pure the love that is glorified in it. He combines these two methods. He finds Christ in the Song of Solomon, as he finds Christ in 'all the Scripture beginning with Moses and the prophets.' But he finds Him through the glory of human love and purity and goodness. The book is most attractively written.

RELIGION AND SCIENCE. By P. N. Waggett, M.A. (*Longmans*. Crown 8vo, pp. 174. 2s. 6d. net).—'Religion and Science'—the mere juxtaposition of the two words brings 'the eternal note of' dulness 'in.' But Mr. Waggett is not dull. The relation between Religion and Science can be discussed with reality and life. There is no dull page in all the book.

Is that wonderful? The wonder is that men could ever have become dull in discussing such a matter. Heredity, for example: what an interest, what a vital practical interest lies in that word! The old Hebrew prophets felt it. We feel it to-day as we read their stinging words—'the children's teeth are set on edge.' Mr. Waggett's words sting also. And he is so bravely generous to Science and to Religion. This is a book to be missed by no preacher or worker amongst men.

THE CONSOLATIONS OF THE CROSS. By the Right Rev. C. H. Brent, D.D. (*Longmans*. Crown 8vo, pp. 122. 2s. 6d. net).—The Bishop of the Philippine Islands has tried to use the Seven Sayings on the Cross in such a way that his hearers should not only admire but repeat them. 'It is finished'? Yes; he believes that we too ought to be able to say, 'It is finished.' He quotes an incident: 'A while since, an afflicted friend sent me one of those home-made tokens of affection that are valuable above gold and silver. "Here," she said, "is a bit of seaweed I gathered some few years back—a bit of God's work which I send as an Easter greeting. Humble enough as far as my own part in it goes, but—God did the rest."' And the Bishop says that if we do our best God will always do the rest, and we shall be able to say, 'It is finished.'

THE COMMON HOPE. Edited by the Rev. Rosslyn Bruce, M.A. (*Longmans*. Crown 8vo, pp. xv, 207. 3s. 6d. net).—The Bishop of Stepney, in introducing this volume, says that there are two kinds of clergymen in the Church of England, the fussy kind and the quiet kind, the noisy platform and press kind and the parish working kind. This is a volume of essays by the quiet kind. These men have not spoken at Church congresses, they have not written letters to the newspapers; they have stayed at home to see what the Gospel of the grace of God was fit for in modern England when it was allowed fair play. Now they come forward to tell what it can do and what are the things in the way that prevent it from doing better. The editor's own essay is the most enjoyable. For he writes of 'The Joy of Ministry,' and he has known it. The one of most doubtful good is Mr. H. B. Freeman's on 'The Church and Temperance.' Mr. Freeman is afraid of fanaticism. The cry against fanaticism is quite a familiar one on this subject, but where are the fanatics?

GOD'S LIVING ORACLES. By Arthur T. Pierson (*Nisbet*. Crown 8vo, pp. x, 257. 3s. 6d. net).—Dr. Pierson thinks that he glorifies the Bible when he proves that the scientific discoveries of modern days are predicted in it—the conservation of energy, the circulation of the blood, and all the rest. His method of proof is peculiar. But if he could prove it, would the Bible be greater, or more the Bible? There is a curious note on page

64: 'Compare Mrs. Helen M. Spurrell's scholarly translation of the Old Testament, published by James Nisbet & Co., London, for which there was so little sale that the edition was sent to the paper-mill, and a copy can be found only in some second-hand book shop. No translation perhaps surpasses it in excellence.' There is much in the book which is puzzling besides that note, but there is also much that is direct and intelligible and most acceptable.

THE EYE-WITNESSES OF CHRIST. By the Rev. Henry F. Henderson, M.A. (*Stockwell*. Crown 8vo, pp. 147. 2s. 6d. net).—The most distinct characteristic of Mr. Henderson's sermons is their plainness. It is a refreshing characteristic. There is too much subtlety in the pulpit—not of thought but of language. Few of us can be too subtle in thought for an average congregation, any one can be too subtle in language. Why is it that sermons are ever called dull? Because preachers can speak unintelligibly. Mr. Henderson is always intelligible. His simple directness is his strength. His audience never asks, What does he mean? Every member of it is edified up to the full extent of his meaning.

The subjects of his sermons are theological, ethical, or even mystical, as the case may be; but they are always practical. Now it is the fact of the Resurrection, now the cultivation of piety, now the command, 'Be pitiful': in every case his hearers hear him gladly and *do* many things.

Mr. Allenson has issued a revised and enlarged edition of *The Nonconformist Minister's Ordinal* (1s. 6d. net). Its circulation is a sign and an encouragement. 'Let all things be done decently and in order.'

The Wonderful Story of Uganda has been told by the Rev. J. D. Mullens, M.A., and published by the Church Missionary Society (1s. 6d.). The interest of Mukasa's autobiography at the end is considerable, it is so evidently real and uncoloured. If he could have remembered more of his early religious notions his story would have been of very great value to the science of religion.

At the price of 1s. net, Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton have published Mr. Frank Ballard's

'*Clarion*' Fallacies, the most trenchant attack yet made on the popular agnosticism of our day.

Professor Skinner has given the 'Century Bible' a great lift. His edition of the *Books of Kings* (Jack; 2s. 6d. net) is out of sight the best commentary in the English language. Its brevity is all in its favour too. For Dr. Skinner says all he means to say in few words, and is always illuminating.

The latest theory of the authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews is that it is a composite production. There was a letter written, not to Christians probably, but to Jews, yet probably by St. Paul or some well-known apostle. This letter got into the hands of some unknown person, who annotated it before reading it to his own Church. His annotations were Christian, his Church was (at least partly) Gentile. So we have a fine mixture. For the annotations got mixed up with the text, and now—Mr. J. S. Foster Chamberlain has disentangled them in his newly published book on *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (E. Johnson).

Messrs. Longmans have issued Newman's *Apologia pro Vita Sua* in a cheap form (6d. net).

Under the title of *The Training of Life*, the Rev. D. W. Whincup, M.A., has published seven sermons on the 'Pilgrim's Progress' (Longmans; 2s. net). The 'Pilgrim' is not often taken into the pulpit, and there are risks run when the Bible is set aside even for Bunyan. But Mr. Whincup is both scriptural and experimental. It is not a very long step from a parable to the immortal allegory in his way of using it. And the common people, he tells us, heard him gladly.

New volumes of Macmillan's Thackeray are *Critical Papers in Art* and *Lovel the Widower* (3s. 6d. each). This is to be the edition of Thackeray for all but the few who fancy fine bindings and can pay for them. It is as satisfactory as a working edition can be.

Messrs. Marshall Brothers have published the first volume of an elaborate scheme of book-making by the Rev. John Urquhart under the general title of *How to Read the Bible* (3s. 6d. net).

The great difficulty with the Resurrection of our Lord in some persons' minds is, What is the good of it? That is to say, Why should the *body* rise? Why is it not enough that the Spirit of Christ should make itself known as alive and able to save? Mr. F. E. Marsh makes a practical answer, in many particulars. The title of his little book is, *What does the Resurrection of Christ Mean?* (Marshall Brothers).

Messrs. Marshall Brothers have published a third and enlarged edition of the Rev. C. H. Waller's book on the Apocalypse, *The Names on the Gates of Pearl*. In the new preface there is a touch of pride in the avowal that, 'I wrote these pages in the full belief that "all Scripture" was "given by inspiration of God." I have not abandoned that position, but I have learned why, in 2 Tim. iii. 16, we say, not "*was*" but "*is* inspired.' Not only the dead writer's autograph, but the "living oracles" are "God's word written" still.'

Another issue of Methuen's 'Library of Devotion,' and an attractive one. It is *A Day Book from the Saints and Fathers*, by the Rev. J. H. Burn, B.D., F.R.S.E. (2s.).

It is surely rather late in the day to 'examine' Bishop Ryle's *Early Narratives of Genesis*. The chapters of the book appeared ten years or more ago in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES; the book itself has been out almost as long. The Rev. George Ensor, M.A., has no opinion of the wisdom or even the knowledge of men like Bishop Ryle. 'Higher critics must know—and if they do not know it, they must be guilty of phenomenal ignorance—that the problems of physical science are yet for us exceedingly profound.' The title of his 'Answer' is, *Bishop Ryle and Genesis* (Nisbet; 2s. 6d. net).

Why is it that Mr. Archibald G. Brown's sermons are so sparingly published? Why is it that they are so little known and read of men? They are among the few that excel equally in the spoken word and the printed page. They are whole-hearted in their evangelical appeal. This volume is published by Simpkin, Marshall, & Co. Its title is, *In the Valley of Decision* (1s. net).

Mr. Stockwell has published a second edition of *The Messages of Christ*, by Nathaniel Wiseman (2s. 6d. net).

Messrs. Williams & Norgate have added to their 'Crown Theological Library' a new edition (the third) of Harnack's *What is Christianity?* (5s.) Mr. Bailey Saunders has revised his translation. No doubt this popular book has some length of life before it yet.

A few smaller books deserve notice:—(1) *An Ordination Charge*, by the Rev. J. A. Kerr Bain, M.A., Livingston (2d.)—wherein the Christian ministry is fascinatingly described in its demands and its rewards; (2) *The Life of Divine Fellowship*, by the Rev. R. M. Lithgow, Lisbon (Macniven & Wallace, 6d.)—an arrangement of the 1st Epistle of St. John, with an Introduction, full of insight, surprisingly fresh; (3) *The Higher Criticism: What is it?* by the Rev. Professor A. F. Simpson, Edinburgh—the very best very brief statement ever seen; (4) *The Church in St. Cecilia's House*, by Walter Pater (S. C. Brown, 3d.); (5) *Gambling*, by the Rev. G. Estwick Ford (R.T.S., 6d.); (6) *Our Marching Orders*, by R. F. Horton (R.T.S., 3d.); (7) *Sin Stand Still*, by the Rev. W. Collins Badger, M.A. (Stock, 2d.); (8) *A Sling Stone for the Critics*, by the Rev. J. H. Townsend (Marshall Brothers, 6d.).

Contributions and Comments.

'Let the Woman learn in Silence.'

It has sometimes been a puzzle to me that English working men, and these not the least intelligent of their class, should be so ready to receive religious teaching from the other sex; and it is my good

fortune to know several noble women whose ministrations in mission halls have received the divine blessing in quite an unmistakable way. Yet St. Paul forbids women to teach, in spite of the prophecy of Joel quoted by Peter on the day of Pentecost. But Paul himself, in 1 Co 11⁵, implies

that women may prophesy; only they must not do it in church (14⁸⁴), and not with uncovered heads. How are we to reconcile these opposite indications?

A ray of light flashed on me the other day. May not *γυνή* and *γυναῖκί* in 1 Ti 2^{11, 12} be better translated 'wife' than 'woman,' and does not this passage refer to the behaviour of Christian women towards their husbands? And why, oh why, have the Authorized Translators made *ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ* mean 'in silence,' and the Revised ones rendered it as 'in quietness,' which *may* mean 'silence,' whereas 'gentleness' would be a more accurate word? If the apostle had really meant 'silence' in his directions to Timothy, he would have said *σιωπῇ* or *σιγῇ*. He uses *σιγάωσαν* in 1 Co 14⁸⁴, where he is speaking of the conduct of women in the church. It seems to me that no one has a right to use the Epistle to Timothy to forbid women being private teachers even of men in religious matters, though in 1 Co they are undoubtedly debarred from taking part in the exhortations of the Church. There must surely have always been a tendency on the part of divines to emphasize slightly, if not to exaggerate, St. Paul's directions with regard to women. Translators take no notice of the little word *ἴνα* in Eph 5⁸³. It appears to me to be a sensible advice to husbands that every one in particular should love his wife even as himself, 'in order that the wife may reverence her husband.' This shade of meaning is left unnoticed both in the Authorized and the Revised versions, the word 'see' introduced by both in italics, tending to make it less visible.

As for 'obey,' it is a monopoly of the Prayer-Book, and is not in the Bible. The word used in Eph 5²² for wives is *ὑποτάσσεσθε*, rightly translated 'submit yourselves,' as church members are also told to do to one another in v.²¹; whereas the word used for children in 6¹ and for slaves in v.⁵ is *ὑπακούετε*, 'obey,' and this is never used in regard to wives.

MARGARET D. GIBSON.

Cambridge.

Was Saul a Hachish-Eater?

AFROPOS of your comments on Dr. Creighton's query, 'Was Saul a Hachish-eater?' in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for January, and the contribution of Rev. J. A. Stokes-Little in the

February issue, it may be worth while to point out that a passage which seems to have a decided bearing on the question whether עץ = 'wood' is ever used in the Old Testament to signify a narcotic, has been apparently overlooked, perhaps because the English version gives little hint of the original. I refer to Jer 11¹⁹, נִשְׁחִיתָה עֵץ בְּלִחְמוֹ, וְנִכְרַחְנוּ מֵאֶרֶץ חַיִּים וְנוֹ = LXX: ἐμβάλωμεν ξύλον εἰς τὸν ἄρτον αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐκτρίψωμεν αὐτὸν ἀπὸ γῆς ζώντων = Vulg. Mittamus lignum in panem ejus, et eradamus eum de terra viventium. Jeremiah represents his enemies to be plotting his secret destruction, saying, 'Come, let us put wood in his bread and uproot him from the land of the living, and his name shall be remembered no more.' Thus both LXX and Vulg. and the early Fathers (Justin, *M. Dial.*, lxxii.; (Ps) Tert., *adv. Jud.*, x., and *Ctr. Marcionem*, xix. and xl.; Cyprian, *Testim.* ii. 20; Lactantius, *Inst.* iv. 18, and *Altercatio Simonis*, ed. Harnack, T.U. i. 3, p. 30), with whom the passage is a favourite prediction of the Cross. Tertullian, for example, writes (*Ctr. Marc.* ut supra), 'which means, of course, the cross upon his (Christ's) body. . . . He declared what he meant by the "bread," when he called the bread his own body.'

Without accepting all the inferences drawn by the scholars who have raised the question, it seems to me worth while to inquire whether in Jer 11¹⁹, and perhaps elsewhere, we have not traces of the use of עץ in a highly interesting and hitherto unrecognized sense.

BENJ. W. BACON.

Yale University.

An Impressionist Sketch of Sin.

Is it fancy? or is it fact? But in the shading of the Hebrew words for sin in Ps 32¹⁻² can we not trace the progress of sin's evolution?

Perhaps involuntary, from the intense realism of the writer, or perhaps purposely, we have illustrated in those four distinctive terms used four different stages in the course of evil.

The first is פָּשַׁע. The root meaning of which is that of separation, or turning away from. Here we have depicted sin at its start, as an act of schism.

The second word is מִצָּחָה. Now we see sin portrayed in action. Its literal meaning is 'the miss-

ing of a mark.' In a flash it suggests the object of sin as that which traverses or thwarts the plans of God. Just like the erratic comet that sweeps through the heavens on its headlong course, seemingly without aim, and threatening ruin to all order.

In the third word, *ἡ*, we find the result of the other two. It represents the evil that brings with it a sense of guilt, and also the conception of punishment. No sooner has the evil deed been committed than there is a revulsion of feeling in the moral nature, we call it guilt, but it is the conscious chill from the withdrawal of God's love, the secret fear of avenging wrath.

The last word, *ῥῆμα*, paints luridly the final condition into which sin twists the soul. Meaning at first deception, it conveys an idea of the utter moral corruption which sin works, the ultimate distortion which is the absolute negation of all that is true and holy and pure.

ALBERT G. MACKINNON.

Lochmaben.

John xvi. 23.

THIS verse is a knot needing yet to be untied. What is the relation between the first 'ask,' 'ask me no question,' and the second, 'make a request.' The first cannot well be made to bear the meaning of the second; but I would suggest that the second covers the first. The disciples will no longer have Christ with them to solve the problems of life, and they are to remember that He has gone to the Father, that in Him communion is open with the Father, and any request in His name will be granted. But the whole trend of the chapter indicates that one chief need will be guidance into Truth, the solution of mysteries, the unlocking of doors. This shall be granted by the Father in Christ. In words of Browning—

The acknowledgment of God in Christ, accepted by thy reason,

Solves for thee all questions in the earth and out of it.

But can this meaning be proved to lie within the N.T. use of *αἰτέω*? Certainly; it is unfolded in Mt 7⁷⁻⁸.

The curious point about this interpretation is that this reference is given at v.²³ by the A.V. of 1611 (and subsequently), and displaced by the R.V. to v.²⁴.

F. WARBURTON LEWIS.

Bowdon.

Note on Jude 5.

ὑπομνήσαι δὲ ὑμᾶς βούλομαι, εἰδότες ἅπας πάντα, ὅτι Κύριος (v. l. Ἰησοῦς) λαὸν ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου σώσας, τὸ δεύτερον τοὺς μὴ πιστεύσαντας ἀπώλεσεν.

Κύριος: Rec. text, *ὁ κ.*, with *KLX*, etc. Certain inferior MSS and vv. read *ὁ Θεός*. AB read *Ἰησοῦς*.

The reading *Ἰησοῦς* is given in the margin of the R.V. as scarcely inferior to that of the text. W.H. also put it in margin, and in supplementary note suspect a primitive corruption, apparently *ΟΤΙΚ* (*ὅτι Κύριος*) and *ΟΤΙ* (*ὅτι Ἰησοῦς*) for *ΟΤΙΟ* (*ὅτι ὁ*).

On the whole it would seem probable that *Ἰησοῦς* is the true reading (so Alford, *al.*) on the ground that it is the most difficult, and therefore most likely to be altered. But the attempts to explain it seem unsatisfactory. 1 Co 10⁴ (*ἡ πέτρα δὲ ἦν ὁ Χριστός*) is obviously not parallel. That the reference is to the 'Angel of his Presence' (Isa 63⁹) or to the 'Angel of God' who went before the Israelites (Ex 14¹⁹, etc.) seems doubtful, in spite of the common identification of that angel with (not Jesus but) the Messiah. [Again, in v.²⁵, Jude distinguishes between God even as Saviour and Jesus (*μόνῳ Θεῷ σωτῇρι ἡμῶν διὰ Ἰησοῦ*); hence *Θεός* certainly, and probably *Κύριος*, become unlikely readings here.] If Jude be the brother of our Lord, this use of the name Jesus here becomes doubly hard to understand.

Query—*Ἰησοῦς*, the right reading, but meaning Joshua? That Joshua did not actually lead the people out of Egypt is irrelevant in so short a summary; he repeatedly saved them on their journey from Egypt; and his second great achievement was to destroy the unbelieving Amorites. The chief objection is that *τετήρηκεν* (v.⁷ fm.) is left without its subject; but *Κύριος* or *Θεός* can be easily supplied. [I incline here, noticing the parallelism with *μὴ τηρήσαντας τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀρχήν*, to supply *ἀρχή* as the subject of *τετήρηκεν*, with a kind of play upon the words; but this is not necessary.]

E. E. KELLETT.

The Leys, Cambridge.

Τὰ ἴδια.

FIVE times in N.T. occurs the expression *τὰ ἴδια*. with verbs of motion, four times in conjunction

with εἰς. In each case the R.V. adopts a different translation.

(1) Lk 18²⁸—we have left our own, mg. our own (homes).

(2) Jo 1¹¹—he came unto his own, mg. Gr. his own things.

(3) Jo 16³²—scattered every man to his own (no mg.).

(4) Jo 19²⁷—took her unto his own (home).

(5) Ac 21⁶—they returned home again.

Would it not be an improvement to adopt the rendering of (1) mg. and (4) in each case? In (2) Milligan and Moulton so translate, thus calling attention to the difference in gender between the two parts of the verse more effectively than R.V. In (3) the bald incompleteness of the clause would be removed.

מִלֵּא אֶת־יָדְךָ

‘To consecrate,’ mg. Heb. fill the hand of, Ex 28⁴¹, Lev 8⁸³, Jg 17⁵, Ezk 43²⁶. Should not the mg. also be found in Jg 17¹², 1 Ki 13³⁸, etc.

ERNEST G. LOOSLEY.

Brandon.

St. Paul's Sojourn in Arabia.¹

A POSSIBLE course of events during the first three years after St. Paul's conversion:—

1. Restoration of sight and baptism by Ananias (Ac 9¹⁷⁻¹⁸).

2. Immediately Saul preaches Jesus in the synagogues and continues to do so till some time (ἡμέραι ἱκαναί) has elapsed (Ac 9²⁰⁻²², Gal 1¹⁶, ἀποκαλύψαι τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐν ἐμοί).

3. His preaching arouses opposition on the part of the Jews. So much so that they plot to kill him. He escapes, however, being let down from the wall of Damascus in a basket (Ac 9²⁵, cf. 2 Co 11^{32, 33}).

4. St. Paul does not stay to communicate with anybody (οὐ προσανεθέμην σαρκὶ καὶ αἵματι) but flees to Arabia, where he remains for some time, perhaps two years (Gal 1¹⁶).

5. He returns to Damascus for a short time and then goes up to Jerusalem (Ac 9²⁶, Gal 1¹⁸).

The chief argument against this view is that the ‘straightway’ of Gal 1¹⁶ refers to events very

soon after St. Paul's conversion. But this is not necessary. The words ἀποκαλύψαι τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐν ἐμοί clearly do not refer to his conversion, but to his preaching in Damascus. [So Lightfoot, *Galatians*, pp. 82, 83. The words ἐν ἐμοί do ‘not speak of a revelation made inwardly to himself, but of a revelation made through him to others.’] It was when St. Paul's words began to arouse opposition that God might be said to have revealed His Son in him.

In favour of this view there are the following considerations:—St. Luke tells us that ‘straightway in the synagogues he preached Jesus,’ *i.e.* immediately after his conversion (see Ac 9²⁰).

There is not necessarily a break between Ac 9²² and v.²⁸. Indeed, the fact that Saul ‘confounded the Jews which dwelt at Damascus’ would naturally result in their taking counsel together to kill him (v.²⁸). For this reason some would place the Arabian sojourn between v.²¹ and v.²², where there is clearly no break in the narrative of the Acts.

The ‘many days’ (ἡμέραι ἱκαναί) of Ac 9²³ have always been a difficulty both to those who would make them include the Arabian sojourn, and also to those who refer them to St. Paul's stay in Damascus after his return from Arabia. They are much more naturally referred to his residence in Damascus after his conversion, a residence of perhaps six to nine months. The ἡμέρας τινάς of Ac 9¹⁹ will thus look forward, while the ἡμέραι ἱκαναί of Ac 9²³ look back.

In Ac 9²⁵ and 2 Co 11³³ we are told that Saul escaped from Damascus by being let down from the city wall in a basket. It is most improbable that he should have gone straight up to Jerusalem, where opposition against him would be strong. St. Luke does not tell us that after his escape he went up to Jerusalem. He seems, in fact, to begin a fresh stage in Ac 9²⁶. He tells us what occurred when St. Paul went up to Jerusalem the first time after his conversion. If we suppose that, after his escape from Damascus, the apostle went to Arabia for a considerable period, perhaps two years, we can quite naturally take his statement of his return to Damascus and subsequent journey to Jerusalem, after a stay of a few weeks (Gal 1^{17, 18}).

The fact that St. Paul ‘conferred not with flesh and blood’ (Gal 1¹⁶) no doubt primarily refers to a time of solitary meditation, but the cause of this time may have been that it was necessary that his whereabouts should not be known. This agrees

¹ On the placing of St. Paul's sojourn in Arabia between his flight from Damascus [Ac 9²⁵, 2 Co 11^{32, 33}] and his first visit to Jerusalem after his conversion [Ac 9²⁶, Gal 1¹⁸].

with other events in the apostle's life, such as his visit to Jerusalem for the Council. He tells us in Gal 2² that he went up by revelation; while St. Luke says that he was sent by the Church at Antioch (Ac 15²; cf. also Ac 22^{17, 18} with Ac 9⁸⁰ and Ac 13^{8, 4}).

St. Paul was not likely to have left Damascus without a clear command from God, which often came to him through his outward circumstances (cf. Gal 4¹⁸). We can well imagine that the apostle would take his escape from Damascus as a call from God for a time of preparation in order that he might preach Christ among the Gentiles.

REGINALD L. COLLINS.

Emmanuel College, Cambridge.

The Imprecatory Psalms.

THE November issue of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES has just come to hand, after wandering over India for more than a month, through a clerical error made in London. The notes on the Imprecatory Psalms lead me to offer a more recent illustration than either of those named by Professor Davis.

In the siege of the Legations at Peking, in the summer of 1900, were two very famous men among the many famous men and women there. One was Professor Gamewell, the American Methodist missionary, who was appointed by Sir Claud MacDonald as superintendent of all the fortifications; the other was the Rev. Arthur H. Smith, D.D., the well-known writer on Chinese subjects, and the author of the best book on the troubles of 1900. These two men met one day in the Legation compound. The Imperial soldiers and fanatical Boxers were firing on the Legations with untiring energy, and it behoved Mr. Gamewell to be here, there, and everywhere to see that all was right. They had only time for a word of greeting, but Dr. Smith, who is nothing if not apt and witty, looking towards the wall from where the shells were being thrown, said to Mr. Gamewell, 'I say, Gamewell, there is some use for the Imprecatory Psalms after all.' I do not know whether this has been put on record. I had it from Mr. Gamewell himself, and respectfully hand it on.

JOHN HEDLEY.

*English Methodist Mission,
Yung Ping Fu, viâ Tientsin,
North China (viâ Siberia),
6th February 1904.*

The Union of the Race with Christ.

THE identification by the Deutero-Isaiah of the 'Suffering Servant' with the elect Israel strikes me as lending support to the Pauline doctrine so ably expounded by Professor Peake that the central doctrine of Christianity is Christ's mystical union with the race.

For Israel, as Professor A. B. Davidson has shown, is a microcosm, a type of humanity. The true Israel was the Suffering Servant of the Lord; true *humanity* is likewise identified with Christ, its Head. In this great mystical doctrine we find Isaiah piercing with prophetic eye and foreshadowing the revelation consummated in the New Testament, especially in the letters of Paul.

HORACE H. THEOBALD.

L.M.S., Benares District.

Coverdale on the Apocrypha.

I AM obliged to Professor Nestle for raising the question of the source of the words, 'patience and study will show that the Apocrypha and the Canon are agreed.' They occur, as given on p. 62 of my *Use of the Apocrypha in the Christian Church*, in Smith's *D.B.* 1671a. They are there quoted by Dean Plumptre, with others, as from Coverdale. The others are to be found verbatim in Coverdale's Preface, but these I cannot see. There is much to a similar effect, but not these precise words. I am inclined to think that they are Dean Plumptre's own summing up, at the end of his paragraph, of Coverdale's opinion, and that the inverted commas, in which he encloses them, are a mistake. His own words and Coverdale's are much mixed up in the paragraph referred to, so that such a misplacing of commas is quite conceivable. But if the sentence does occur in any of Coverdale's writings, I shall be grateful to any one who will point it out, with a view to correcting the error (if such it is) in an enlarged edition of *The Use of the Apocrypha in the Christian Church*, which I hope may eventually appear.

W. H. DAUBNEY.

*St. Margaret's Gate,
Bury St. Edmunds.*

Tree-Worship and Similar Practices in China.

IN THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for June 1903 appeared an article on 'Traces of Tree-Worship in the Old Testament.' It would be very interesting to note how far such 'tree-worship' extends into other countries beyond Syria. We have such a cult in China. Not only do we find 'tree-worship,' but also the worship of other objects, such as cave-pools, springs, graves, rocks. All these objects are supposed at some time or other to have been efficacious on behalf of the sufferer or the poverty-stricken.



With this kind of worship there is not associated any idea of the Divine. From the present Chinese mind the Divine has been completely eradicated. There is only an idea of innumerable spirits or ghosts or demons. These spirits may be appeased and thus brought to render help to those in need, but generally they are inimical to man's welfare. Worship is a thing of fear, not of reverence, in China.

In one of the back streets of Ichang stands an old tree, which is regularly worshipped. It is said

to be possessed by a spirit with black horns. The barren pray to it for offspring, those who have sick in their homes seek healing for them here, those in distress cry for relief. The tree is hung with pieces of red cloth and honorary tablets (see the illustration). These are evidences that the worshippers have received that for which they prayed, and have attributed the blessings received to the tree or the spirit dwelling in it. The inscriptions on the tablets have not much variety of expression. The following are common: 'Ask, and ye shall receive,' 'Efficacious,' 'Those who come obtain,' 'The abode of the spirits.' Perhaps in a few years this tree will be discarded for another found to be more efficacious.

After reading the article above mentioned, I paid more attention to the objects of worship round about, and in one country trip discovered the following. By the roadside was a grave decorated with banners showing that it was worshipped. On inquiring about it, I was told that a man connected formerly with an official's residence was buried there. Those in difficulty prayed at the spot for help, and as affairs turned out in their favour, the grave was considered 'efficacious.'

Farther on in a valley I found a small hole dug out in the side of a rock by the side of a stream. Inside the hole were set up three small stones, one on top of another, and outside on a pole was hung a crescent-shaped piece of wood with the one character '*ling*,' i.e. 'spiritual,' carved upon it. At another place I saw an inscribed stone tablet built in a shrine. In front of it stood several wooden standards—marks of a sacred place—and hanging in front of the stone this one word '*ling*,' or 'spiritual.'

Ten miles from Ichang is a large cave with a pool of clear water in it. The pool is believed to be inhabited by dragons, hence the water is very efficacious. In cases of severe sickness, water is carried from this pool for the sick one to drink.

When such a cult as this entered China is hard to determine. No doubt it existed in the days of the sages, but was fostered and grew in belief under Taoism and Buddhism. Those two religions work much on the superstitious fears of the people, and seize every opportunity of extending their influence for the sake of money. We find superstition dies hard even in the hearts of our Church members.

W. DEANS.

Ichang, China.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, St. Cyrus, Montrose.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE EXTRA VOLUME of the *Dictionary of the Bible* is now out of the editor's hands, and will be ready for issue in a very short time. It contains more matter than any of the volumes already published, and it is actually larger in size than any of them, except the fourth. The Articles are almost all of considerable length, and there are thirty-seven of them. Besides the articles, it contains six Indexes and four new Maps.

The longest article in the volume, as has already been mentioned, is that of Professor Kautzsch on the RELIGION OF ISRAEL. It is also the longest article in the *Dictionary*. Professor Sanday's article on JESUS CHRIST, in the second volume, runs to fifty-one pages. There is no article of the same magnitude within the four volumes. But in the Extra Volume, while Professor Ramsay on the RELIGION OF GREECE AND ASIA MINOR covers forty-eight pages, and Professor Morris Jastrow on the RELIGION OF BABYLONIA exactly the same space as Dr. Sanday, the article by Professor Kautzsch on the Religion of Israel is a hundred and twenty-one pages in length.

Yet it is an article. It is an article for a dictionary. It is not a book. If it had been a book we cannot suppose that Professor Kautzsch would have been careful to see that every sentence should be exactly in its place, weighted with as much

meaning as perfect clearness would allow it to carry. If it had been a book it would have been a bulky book, and would have cost nearly as much as this whole volume. 'It will indeed,' says a great English scholar, who has read it in proof, 'be a star of the first magnitude in the new volume.'

There is no department of the study of the Bible in which English scholarship has more resolutely refused to follow the lead of German scholarship than in the study of the Fourth Gospel. The time will come when scholars everywhere will recognize that Westcott and Sanday were the means under God of preserving that Gospel for the use of our generation. It is the loss of the Fourth Gospel that is the cause of that thinness of blood which one sees so plainly in the German exegesis of our day. Jülicher, in his second edition, has gone a long way towards an English appreciation of St. John, but he has a long way yet to go. English scholars like Dr. Edwin Abbott, who once adopted the German manner, are ready now to throw it off.

Dr. Edwin Abbott has published a new book. He has found a new name for it. With an ingenuity that would send some publishers into an asylum, he calls his new book by the utterly unattractive title of *Paradosis* (A. & C. Black; 8vo, pp. xxiii, 216, 7s. 6d. net). It is a successor to

Clue; it is one of the series of *Diatessarica*. The most welcome thing in Dr. Abbott's new book is the new appreciation of St. John.

Paradosis means delivering up. The book is written to prove that when the Synoptic Gospels speak of the delivering up of Jesus by Judas to the servants of Caiaphas, they make a mistake, what they ought to speak about is the delivering up of the Son by the Father for the redemption of mankind. It is the Synoptists that make the mistake. St. Paul does not make it, nor St. Peter, *nor the Fourth Gospel*. This is all in the preface. And before the preface is closed Dr. Abbott has succeeded in saying that 'the Fourth Gospel brings us closest, not indeed to the words, but to the mind of Christ.' That is a great thing for Dr. Abbott to say.

But about this Paradosis. Dr. Abbott says that even St. Paul never refers to Christ's betrayal by Judas. We at once recall—for are they not very familiar?—the words of the Institution: 'on that night in which He was betrayed.' Dr. Abbott says that that is a mistranslation. The true translation is, 'In the night in which He was delivered up [by the Father as a sacrifice for sinners].' For there is no other place in St. Paul's Epistles in which this Greek word is translated, or can be translated, 'betrayed.' And although our Lord speaks in the Synoptic Gospels of being betrayed (as if by Judas) into the hands of sinners, that is a mistake in the Synoptic Gospels. In all such cases He really spoke of His being delivered up by the Father.

What is the difference? Dr. Abbott says that the difference and the gain are very great. 'We gain an immense help towards the recognition and sincere worship of our Lord as God. There is all the world of difference between the mind's eye of a seer fixed in a kind of second-sight on Judas, and the mind's eye of a Saviour and Son of God fixed on the inscrutable wisdom with which the Father overrules sin and suffering so as to make them subservient to the redemption and

perfection of man.' And if Dr. Abbott is right there is a greater difference even than that.

The Father delivers up the Son. But the Son is at one with the Father, and delivers Himself up. And another way of saying that He delivers up Himself is to say with Isaiah that He 'pours out His *soul* unto death.' For the soul is used for the self, including the body. It may even, paradoxically enough, be used for the body alone, or the body may be used for it. What have we then? In the institution of the Eucharist we have our Lord saying, 'This is my body.' He means, 'This is my soul or self.' In the Eucharist He has no thought of the body apart from the self. He simply means that He is pouring out His soul unto death. And when He encourages His disciples, saying, 'This do in remembrance of me,' He means, 'Do as I am doing. As I give my life a ransom for you, so give ye your lives for the heathen. As I lose my life, so lose ye yours, that ye may gain it unto life eternal.' Dr. Abbott does not deny that Christ 'contemplated a continuous celebration of the evening meal of thanksgiving in future generations.' But he holds that its only efficacy is in the spirit of self-sacrifice which it illustrates and expects.

'The kingdom of God cometh not with observation: neither shall they say, Lo, here! or, There! for lo, the kingdom of God is within you.' So the Revised Version as well as the Authorized, repeating the margin, 'or, among you.' But it was the Pharisees who asked, 'when the kingdom of God cometh.' Was it within *them*? Would our Lord be likely to say so?

Mr. Muirhead, in his *Eschatology of Jesus*, elsewhere noticed, thinks that Christ would not be likely to say so. And yet he is pressed with the thought that our Lord spoke always of His kingdom as spiritual and would not miss the chance of speaking of it as spiritual now. So he thinks there is an ambiguity in the word. Grammatically

either meaning is admissible. Dalman, who argues for 'within you,' as the most likely Aramaic original of the Greek word (ἐντός), is answered by J. Weiss that, on Dalman's own argument, 'among you' is the more likely form in Aramaic. So Mr. Muirhead thinks that our Lord expressly chose an ambiguous expression, not committing Himself to the statement that the kingdom of God was within the Pharisees, and yet not missing the opportunity of suggesting its essential inwardness.

It is the day of freedom of speech. There are still, no doubt, ways of making men feel that by their words they may be condemned. Mr. Beeby has discovered that. But Mr. Beeby protests that the Bishop of Worcester took an unfair advantage of him. He appealed to him *as an honest man* to resign. And now, Mr. Beeby reads articles by Canon Hensley Henson in every other magazine, and every article as 'unfaithful to the ordination vow' as ever his own words were, and no one asks Canon Henson to resign.

It is the day of freedom of speech. But you must be able to resist appeals to your honesty. Canon Hensley Henson is able. He has had appeals enough, for he has many watchful enemies. But his open and undisguised intention is to get the ordination vows altered. He wants the Creeds revised and the Lectionary reconstructed. And he is not weakly going to resign his canonry and so lose the power which 'being set in no obscure place,' as he puts it, gives him for gaining that great end.

So when the Headmaster of Merchant Taylors' School deplores in the *Guardian* the extraordinary length Canon Hensley Henson has gone, he does not ask him to resign his canonry. He simply asks him to be more cautious. His own experience as a teacher 'has impressed him deeply with the need of caution in communicating, to relatively uninstructed minds, views of a purely subjective

character, which, however unsatisfactory and uncritical in themselves, may possibly be accepted by some on the bare word of those who gave them currency.'

What has Canon Henson been saying? He has been saying two strong things in one month. The one appears in the *Contemporary Review*, the other in the *Hibbert Journal*. In the *Contemporary Review* he demands a revision of the Lectionary. He wants certain things cut out of it, especially 'the incredible, puerile, or demoralizing narratives which the Old Testament contains'; and he wants certain things put into it, in particular 'Christian compositions which have secured the approval of general acceptance, and taken the rank of spiritual classics among religious people.'

In the *Hibbert Journal* he demands a revision of the Creed. His chief trouble is over the Resurrection. He himself believes the Resurrection. He has no doubt that Jesus Christ survived death, and that 'not in an impoverished ghostly state, but in the fulness of personal life,' and that He made His presence known to His disciples. But there are good men and true who cannot accept so much as that. Canon Henson would like to retain them. He would therefore not insist on 'the Lord was raised'; he would be content to say 'the Lord lives.' Besides, there are details of the Resurrection narratives which he himself has trouble with. The material nature of Christ's risen body, the empty tomb, and the third day—these are in his opinion both unproved and unnecessary.

It is not easy to see how Canon Hensley Henson can say 'the Lord lives' if he cannot say 'the Lord was raised.' It is not easy to see what good it will do him. But let that pass. Why does he dispute the nature of the Lord's risen body? Because there is not sufficient evidence for it. Its evidence rests with St. Luke. It is he that says Jesus took food, and ate it before the

disciples. St. Paul does not mention such a thing. St. Paul seems even to reject such a conception, when he says that flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom.

Why does he reject the empty tomb? Again, on insufficient evidence. It is true that *all* the evangelists speak of it, but then St. Paul does not. Canon Henson cannot understand St. Paul's silence if he knew of it. Why, finally, does he renounce the third day? On insufficient evidence. For, although in this case the fact is held as firmly by St. Paul as by the evangelists, Canon Henson would require more evidence than that, because he thinks it likely that the idea of rising again the third day was suggested to the disciples by the Old Testament.

Canon Hensley Henson does not claim to be a critic. He relies on the criticism of other men. And Mr. Arbuthnot Nairn has little difficulty in showing how great a risk the man runs who goes out seeking such dangerous adventures in other men's armour. His great stand-by is Schmiedel. But he misunderstands Schmiedel, and misrepresents him. And how ridiculous is the attitude of a man who thinks he could believe in the risen body if the Gospels would agree to recommend it; who would accept the empty tomb if St. Paul would confirm it as well as the Gospels; who at last wants something else when all the Gospels and St. Paul testify that Christ rose on the third day. These matters are all the proper subject of criticism. Mr. Arbuthnot Nairn's objection is that this is not criticism.

Professor Sanday has written an article in the *Journal of Theological Studies* for April on 'The Injunctions of Silence in the Gospels.' Some two years ago Professor Wrede of Breslau published a book, in which he used these injunctions of silence as evidence that our Lord did not claim to be Messiah. If Jesus had claimed to be Messiah, He would never, says Professor Wrede,

have gone about preventing His followers from publishing that claim. If He had wrought miracles in support of His Messianic claims He would never have forbidden those who profited by the miracles to speak about them. Professor Wrede says that Jesus never claimed to be Messiah, and never wrought miracles in support of such a claim. It was after His Resurrection that His disciples, coming to believe that He was God, read back this belief into His life, asserted that He had claimed the Messiahship, and proved His claim by miracle; and when asked why nobody knew this while He was alive, met the difficulty by saying that He had forbidden them to speak of it.

Professor Sanday cannot believe that. He finds it easier to believe that Jesus did work miracles, and did claim to be the Messiah, and that He often enjoined silence about these things just as we have it in the Gospels. For he feels the unmistakable touch of sincerity in those narratives. They seem to him not only strictly but beautifully historical. 'There is just that paradoxical touch about them which is the sure guarantee of truth. What writer of fiction,' he asks, 'especially of the naïve fiction current in those days, would ever have thought of introducing such features, with just that kind of seeming self-contradiction?'

Why, then, did Jesus enjoin silence on those who confessed His Messiahship? Why did He often charge those whom He had healed to tell no man? Professor Sanday is not sure that he is altogether able to say. There was one prophecy about the Messiah with which these injunctions to silence were in fine accord. It is the prophecy that the Servant of the Lord 'shall not strive nor cry, nor lift up his voice in the streets.' The Jews had forgotten that prophecy. They looked for a political Messiah. Men gathered round Jesus, eager young men, full of courage and enthusiasm, ready to take the sword, ready at any moment to rise against the Romans, waiting only for a leader. Ever since the dethronement of Archelaus and

the annexation of Judæa by Rome in 6 A.D., there had been this temper of sullen acquiescence biding its time. The memory of the Maccabæan rising still lived in men's minds, and of the wonderful feats that had then been wrought against desperate odds. What, then, might not be done with a prophet at the head—nay, one more than a prophet, who was assured of the alliance and succour of Heaven?

Our Lord could not wholly disappoint, and yet He could not encourage this enthusiasm. As enthusiasm it was good, but it was enthusiasm of the wrong sort. It needed to be enlightened, disciplined, purified; so the record of the Gospels is of seeming paradox, seeming cross-purpose. Now He seems to stimulate, again He seems to restrain. Dr. Sanday believes that the cross-purpose is only in our imperfect knowledge. If we knew all, we should know that He adapted His treatment to each case as it arose, diagnosing with perfect insight the temper of those with whom He had to deal and adjusting His own attitude accordingly.

But Professor Sanday believes that there is more in the injunctions to silence than that. He sees that when Jesus enjoins silence His language is constantly emphatic: 'Jesus rebuked (*ἐπετίμησεν*) the unclean spirit, saying, Hold thy peace, and come out of him' (Mk 1²⁵); 'And He chargeth them much (*πολλὰ ἐπετίμα αὐτοῖς*) that they should not make Him known' (Mk 3¹², cf. 8³⁰); 'And He chargeth them much (*δυσχετεῖ αὐτοῖς πολλὰ*) that no man should know this' (Mk 5⁴³, cf. 7⁸⁶ 9⁹).

What sort of language is this? It is the language of emotion, says Dr. Sanday, the language of strong emotion. Now there was one occasion on which our Lord used stronger language even than this. It was after St. Peter's confession. Immediately after that confession came the first prediction of the Passion and the Crucifixion and the Resurrection. St. Peter was taken by surprise. He was sincerely shocked. He took Jesus and

began to rebuke Him. 'Then Jesus, turning about, and seeing His disciples, rebuked Peter, and saith, Get thee behind Me, Satan: for thou mindest not the things of God, but the things of men.'

Professor Sanday believes that the reason of the strong language in all these places is the same. It is personal. It has to do with the Lord Himself. Words like these are not the calm enunciation of a policy, or the didactic outpouring of a lesson. They come up from the depths. They are spoken with heat. It is the reaction against temptation. And the temptation is keenly felt, felt as temptation.

Dr. Sanday has none of that ease with which some writers seem to move in the region of our Lord's human consciousness. He does not profess to be well acquainted with it. He cannot handle it freely. He has no skill in eking out the limited data supplied by the Gospels. But here he is within the Gospels themselves. He remembers that in one of the scenes of the Temptation in the Wilderness Jesus was taken up into an exceeding high mountain and shown the kingdoms of the world. The story is symbolical. It gathers up the significance of more than one actual incident in our Lord's life. Jesus is conscious of supernatural power. If He would He could make these kingdoms His. But only by giving up His Messianic mission. He came to serve. He came to be obedient unto death, even the death of the Cross. The prospect of the Cross was now before Him. It carried a real temptation. 'Father,' He said, even after this, 'Father, if it be possible let this cup pass from Me.' When Peter made his unhappy impulsive speech, he was doing, without knowing it, the devil's work. Jesus felt the temptation. 'Get thee behind Me, Satan.'

'Among the uses of the Old Testament,' said Professor A. B. Davidson once in an article in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, 'there is one that

deserves special emphasis—the firmness of voice with which the Old Testament says “God.” It utters little but one word to men, but this is the word.’

It is the utterance of this word that determines everything which the Old Testament contains. It determines the Old Testament view of the Future State. Why is it that men have been so slow to understand the Old Testament teaching upon the Future State? It is because they have not seen that the Old Testament conception of the Future follows the Old Testament conception of God. Now the Old Testament conception of God is progressive, and the conception of the Future makes progress with it. The difficulty of arriving at an understanding of the Old Testament doctrine of the Future State is due to the fact that that doctrine is not always the same.

In the end of last year a course of lectures on the Psalms was given in St. Patrick’s Cathedral in Dublin. The lectures have now been published by Messrs. S. C. Brown, Langham, & Company, under the title of *The Psalms of Israel* (crown 8vo, 3s. 6d.). One of the lectures, by the Rev. Prebendary L. A. Pooler, B.D., deals with the Eschatology of the Psalms. In that lecture Prebendary Pooler shows that the conception of the Future State held by the Psalmists is inconsistent. It is inconsistent because it is progressive.

Prebendary Pooler begins his lecture by making two quotations from the Psalms. The first is Ps 88⁵—

Like the slain that lie in the grave,
Whom Thou rememberest no more;
And they are cut off from Thy hand.

The other is Ps 139^{7, 8}—

Whither shall I go from Thy Spirit?
Or whither shall I flee from Thy presence?
If I ascend unto Heaven, Thou art there:
If I make my bed in Sheol, behold, Thou art there.

Do the writers of those two passages agree in their thought of the Future State? Prebendary

Pooler says they do not agree. And he says that the reason of their disagreement lies in the difference of their date. The one had a conception of God and therefore of the Future State which the other had grown out of.

Prebendary Pooler finds three distinct moments in the knowledge of God and of the Future Life in Israel. In the first stage of their existence he believes that the Israelites were simply Semites. They were Semites with possibilities, perhaps with actual powers, within them which would one day lead them up to great things. But as yet they believed as the other Semitic nations believed, and for that matter, as all the nations of the earth seem to have believed at the beginning.

They did not believe in God. They scarcely believed in gods. They believed in demons or spirits. These demons or spirits were of good or ill intent, mostly of ill. And the object of all worship was to attract the good or drive away the evil. Images were made of them, and called *teraphim*; and the early Israelites carried these images with them wherever they went. Rachel felt so much safer and better when she stole the household *teraphim* of her uncle Laban and hoped to have them beside her in her new home. Michal found an unexpected use for them when the hour of danger to her husband David came. She placed the image in the bed that the murderers might mistake it for her husband himself.

Prebendary Pooler believes that these spirits were the ghosts or souls of dead ancestors. He believes that the early Israelites were not only Animists, but Ancestor-worshippers. Sheol was peopled with the souls of the dead. They were not dead. They were not confined to Sheol. They took a keen interest in the affairs of the world above them. They knew what was going on and even what the future would bring forth, and they were sometimes called the ‘knowing ones’ (Lev 20²⁷). They could be consulted. They could be summoned out of Sheol for con-

sultation with those who were still alive. At Endor, even in the days of Saul, there lived a wise woman who could bring up the soul of the dead into the land of the living to tell what the future was to bring forth in a great crisis of a great man's history.

Then Jehovah came. The years and the agonies through which the Israelites passed before He came we need not dwell upon. From the worship of demons they had passed, we may be sure, to the worship of proper gods. The demons were not extinguished. But they were gradually more and more confined to the place where they did *not* delight to dwell, the abode of the departed. The gods reigned in heaven and on earth and under the earth.

When Jehovah came, He came at first as one of the gods. Prebendary Pooler is bold enough to believe, with Wellhausen, that He came from Mount Sinai. He believes that He was the God of the tribes that used to pasture their flocks around that mountain, and that even in the days of Deborah He is still conceived of as coming all the way from Sinai to help the Israelites against their enemies in the north. But wherever He came from He came as one of the gods. His jurisdiction was limited. At first the grassy plains and black rocks of Mount Sinai if you will. Certainly afterwards 'in Salem was His tabernacle and His dwelling-place in Sion.' He was the God of the land of Canaan.

Beyond the borders of the Promised Land Jehovah had as yet no proper jurisdiction. David complained that in being driven out of Canaan he was driven to the worship of strange gods. And if Philistia, how much more was Sheol beyond His jurisdiction. The under-world had its own gods. They needed no help in their government from the gods of the world above, they would brook no interference. The living were under the control of Merodach or Sin if they dwelt in Babylonia, of Ra or Isis if they dwelt in the land

of Egypt, of Chemosh if they dwelt in the cities of Moab, of Jehovah if they dwelt in Canaan. But the moment that they died, they passed into the realm of the dead and under the control of the gods of the under-world. When the Israelite died, he did not cease to be, but he ceased to have Jehovah for his God. This was the bitterness of it. He became—not extinct, that would have been easier—but one of those

Whom Thou rememberest no more;
And they are cut off from Thy hand.

It would have been easier for the Israelite if he had ceased to be. That was the next step that was taken. The Israelite at death ceased to be.

To Prebendary Pooler there is no question that at a certain period in their history the Israelites came to believe that death was practical extinction. 'O spare me,' cries one Psalmist piteously, 'that I may recover strength, before I go hence and be no more.' 'For there is hope of a tree,' says Job, 'if it be cut down, that it will sprout again, and that the tender branch thereof will not cease; but man giveth up the ghost, and where is he?'

They came to believe this. It was not their earliest belief. It was a rescue from their earliest and most dreadful belief. For to the pious follower of Jehovah it was less terrible to 'be no more' than to be under other gods. It was a step forward in their knowledge of God. They conceived that all life was the gift of Jehovah their God. 'Jehovah God formed man of dust from the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a *living soul*.' So the existence of the very soul of man depends henceforth upon the possession of this 'breath of life.' Hitherto it has been understood that the body perished at death, but the soul lived on in Sheol. Now the soul perishes also, becomes, in the striking words of Numbers 6⁶, 'a dead soul' the moment the breath of life is withdrawn. Now 'the dust returns to the earth as it was, and the

spirit returns to God who gave it.' The Israelite ceased to be.

This did not enlarge the boundaries of the realm of Jehovah, but it extinguished the gods of the under-world. It extinguished also all approaches to ancestor-worship, and much of the degrading dread of demons. It was a step in advance. It prepared the way for the recognition of Jehovah as the only living and true God. Soon Jehovah will be the God of the living in the hereafter as well as here.

The Sadducees never took another step. They never came to believe in the life to come. They arrested revelation at this stage in its progress. They cut off a portion of the past and called it tradition, and were content with it. They counted Sheol a synonym for Abaddon or Destruction. They quoted the 88th Psalm, 'Shall Thy loving-kindness be declared in the grave, or thy faithful-

ness in Abaddon.' They said, 'Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die.'

This next great moment in the progress of Israel's belief in the Future came in with Amos. It came with a new revelation of Jehovah. According to Amos, Jehovah not only brought the children of Israel out of Egypt, He also brought the Philistines from Caphtor, and the Syrians from Kir. He is the God of the nations over all the earth. He is the Creator of heaven and earth. Sheol also comes under His authority. Now there is no passing beyond the skirts of His white raiment.

Whither shall I go from Thy Spirit?
Or whither shall I flee from Thy presence?
If I ascend unto Heaven, Thou art there;
If I make my bed in Sheol, behold, Thou art there.

This is the 139th Psalm. Prebendary Pooler holds that it is the high-water mark of the Psalter.

Can We still Defend a Vicariously Penal Element in the Atonement?¹

BY THE REV. W. D. MACLAREN, M.A.

IN the discussion of this question we must assume the Being of God, man's present alienation from Him, and His constantly reconciling action on the souls of men. It will also be allowed that all professedly Christian teachers, whatever their view of Christ's person, regard His mission as specially concerned in bringing about this reconciliation. Behind these assumptions we cannot at present go. Our question further implies the existence and quondam popularity of an opinion that this reconciliation of man with God has taken place in virtue of a penalty incurred but not endured by the wrong-doer, endured but not incurred by Christ, in the name of those thus redeemed. With this theory there has always been presented a corre-

sponding conception of the whole Christian economy.

It is equally notorious that this opinion can to-day hardly get a hearing, and that it is chiefly defended, even by those in whose Christian experience it is most deeply intertwined, by arguments and formulæ of a traditional character, which seldom venture to deal with the ultimate realities of the question. The extreme individualism of the greater part of the nineteenth century was hostile to the admission of any vicarious element in the divine treatment of sinful men. A purely humanitarian view of Christ's person naturally associates itself with individualism as to the nature and effect of this mission. Not a few, however, who most strongly affirm the trinitarian view of Christ's person, and who admit therefore the entrance into the human race of an extraordinary type, deny that His mission, while

¹ This paper was first prepared for the Manchester Ministers' Association a few years ago, and has since been discussed at a number of other ministerial gatherings in different parts of England.

inclusive of much undeserved suffering, in any way effects a remission to the offenders of their penalty of suffering, save so far as His sympathy reclaims them and renders further penalty needless; but He endures nothing, it is said, which they escape, while they escape nothing which He endures. There are, on the other hand, those who confess the action of a representative principle in human affairs, and who allow a certain representative relation of Christ to the race, in virtue of which His perfect obedience procures a divine forbearance and even favour towards those whom He represents. Yet many even of such are found to deny any representative virtue to Christ the Penalty-bearer, and any consequent modification of the divine attitude towards sin. The vicarious element in His life and work, say such, is not to be regarded as penal; nor the penalties which He shared as vicarious.

Our question suggests the conclusion which we now desire to maintain, that, in spite of the consensus of opinion against us, the presence of an element at once penal and vicarious in the reconciliation effected by Christ can be made credible and attractive alike to those who emphasize the spontaneity and exuberance of the divine mercy, and to those who insist on the continued uniformity of the natural law in the spiritual sphere; that indeed it is an element which cannot be dispensed with by either. With a view to this conclusion, we shall consider: (1) The Nature and Design of Penalty; (2) Penalty and Reconciliation; (3) Reconciliation and Representation.

i. *The Nature and Design of Penalty.*—Penalty is conceived as the evils, whether moral or physical, attaching to evil-doing. When we consider these as consequences following from the nature of the act, as, for example, the acquisition of evil habit or the misery to one's neighbour, we imply, in regarding them as penalty, a belief in the whole order of nature as expressive of the universal and particular Divine Government. We cannot proceed without inquiring what is the object of such penalty. It has often been pointed out that the immediate object cannot be to reform offenders, nor to deter from further offence; inasmuch as neither reformation nor deterrence will ensue, unless the penalty be both just and be felt to be just. Is retribution, then, the proper end of penalty? What constitutes the essential justice of mere retribution? And why should retribution be

an end in itself? If neither reform nor deterrence be thus the primary design in the divine sequence of penalty, what satisfaction can the Creator or any of His moral creatures find in penal suffering? We are driven to affirm positively that penalty in its ultimate significance is the operation of the divine mind, expressing itself in its abhorrence of evil. Now, there is no alternative between absolute Materialism and a thoroughgoing Theism. By such Theism we mean the conception of the material world and its working, as not merely the creation of a Supreme Mind, but also as, in every one of its properties and laws, an expression and revelation of the moral and spiritual thought of Him who is the Holy One. This follows from the revelation being made to a human creature who, besides being intelligent, is also moral and spiritual. On this view then *penalty means that the evil act or conduct is as loathsome to God as its consequences are to the evil-doer.* It is obvious that such consequences may help both to deter and to reform, supposing, that is, that the evil-doer or others can be made to understand them when threatened, or survive them when endured; of which anon. Such a view of the nature and design of penalty prepares us to perceive the true relation between—

* ii. *Penalty and Reconciliation.*—Until the offender and the offended concur in their judgment of the offence, they can have no real harmony the one with the other. If this be true as between mere fallible mortals, how much more important that sinful men should concur with God in His view of their sin! But how concur except this view be revealed? And how can it be revealed without divine self-expression? and, again, how expressed without penalty? If there be a remission of the penalty, there remains no divine dictum upon sin, no oracle of revelation to the sinner concerning the nature of his fault. The sinner has no occasion for repentance for a fault of which he knows nothing. And even were he penitent, there could be found no adequate expression of his penitence; for penitence ever carries unreserved consent to the infliction of appropriate penalty. Yet without such consent he cannot be assured of reconciliation, based on that concurrence in the divine view of his sin. The desire itself for reconciliation, whether it be God's or the sinner's, covers a yearning for the divine mind to express itself in penalty sufficient to declare the nature of

the offence. Thus alone can both parties be satisfied.

But what is this penalty? Towards sin can God stand in any but one attitude—that of inexorable intolerance? Sin or evil however is only a relation. There is no such thing as sin apart from the sinner. The common saying that ‘God hates sin, but loves the sinner’ is really a most misleading expression of a half truth, tending to destroy men’s sense of the reality of their sinful state. Hence we must confess that the really intolerable object is the sinner himself, the more he has been and still is loved the more intolerable. The wages therefore of sin is death. The sinner through his sinfulness is unfit to live, and God, in His well-fitted government, withdraws from him without cruelty or harshness, or want of love, the life of which he is unworthy. Rather the sinner, in withdrawing himself from God, has withdrawn himself from the conditions of permanent life. Nothing short of this can adequately express the divine mind and the mind of all righteous beings upon moral evil. Herein lies the real absurdity of the once popular view of penalty as endless suffering, not in its supposed cruelty, but in its utter inadequacy and insufficiency. It is irrational. According to it, the punishment of the reprobate was the divine folly, the one unfinished work of the Lord who, according to prophet and apostle, finishes His work of judgment and cuts it short in righteousness. Suffering has indeed its place in the economy of the reprobate, as the threat or instalment of the ensuing destruction. As such, it might well be a merciful warning, but it cannot be, either to God or the sinner, an equivalent symbol of the awfulness of his sin.

Yet observe the pass to which we are now brought. The sinner is indeed deterred from his offence, but it is by his abolition. He is made fully aware of his wrong-doing, but cannot reform; for the knowledge dissolves him. It is indeed retributive, but the wages are fatal. It is thoroughly constitutional, inwoven with the fabric of nature, and analogous to the fate befalling all the lower creatures whose nature cannot attain to fitness for permanent life. In it is nothing arbitrary; rather is it but an instance of the divine laws of life expressed in the working of the whole universe; but it is relentless. Reconciliation then is impossible without the declaration given by the infliction of penalty, for the sinner in that case

would not know what he has done. Reconciliation is equally impossible when the only declaratory penalty is inflicted, for he no longer lives to be reconciled.

Where there is no death, there is no divine self-expression upon sin; where there is no divine self-expression upon sin, there is no revelation to the sinner of the nature of his sin; where there is no revelation to the sinner, there is no means of repentance; where there is no repentance, there is no reconciliation; therefore, where there is no death, there is no reconciliation.

This relentlessness of the constitution of the universe in its moral aspects is forecast by what we know—and at no time so convincingly as at the present—of the uniformity of what we call Physical Law. And if we are to shut out miracle from the physical world, then we must equally shut out mercy from the moral. No miracle spells no mercy. ‘For by the law,’ the revelation of God in the constitution of Nature, is still ‘the knowledge of sin.’

iii. *Reconciliation and Representation.*—Is reconciliation, then, for ever hopeless? By no means. There *is* mercy in the moral, as there is significant miracle in the physical world. Neither contradicts but each complements that uniform sequence which we call Law. There is life for the unfit on conditions which fit him to go on living, though of himself he no longer has a virtue which fits him to live. The principle which makes this recreation of life possible is one already inwoven with the constitution of moral beings as thoroughly as is the sequence of sin and death. It is the great *representative principle*. Like we this principle or not, we are compelled to act on it every day, and cannot refuse it a place in, or even suppose it to be absent from, that Divine action which the human only reflects. Through it, in the physical world, the life of a healthy body overcomes disease in the injured member. Through it, intelligent and moral beings, while retaining full individuality, can act the one for the other, in virtue of a deep unifying principle of fellowship, and in a sphere measured by the varying extent of that fellowship. Thus parent acts for child, husband for wife, partner for partner, councillor for citizen, ambassador for State.

The great embodiment of the representative principle is the Lord Jesus Christ. He is the representative of man, because also the repre-

sentative of God and of the universe. Unique, even at the lower estimate, He is the perfect flower of humanity, its own absolutely worthy personage, who realizes its ideal. In this way at least He stands for man, as the true Servant of Jehovah, the true Son who trusts the Heavenly Father. Why not also the true Sufferer for man, not only sharing the ordinary incidental woe of mankind, but suffering the consequence of sin as none but the Holy One could suffer, enduring to the uttermost the infliction of death, that inevitable result of sin? On the higher estimate of Christ, He was within creation from the first, and finally assumed true human nature for this very purpose of representation, so 'partaking of flesh and blood,' not so much to bring a message and to give an example, but that by this death (*ἵνα διὰ τοῦ θανάτου*) He might deliver the death-doomed tremblers. In this unique instance, in the vicarious life and death of the Son of man, the representative principle by which men act for and in one another finds its consummation.

We say 'for' and 'in,' words which express the involuntary and the voluntary sides of the representative scheme. These are the two pivots upon which New Testament theology turns. For representative action in human affairs, though largely efficacious without the consent of the represented, is fully valid only with their personal choice. There are, accordingly, two identifications of humanity with the Son of man. By the one of these the race involuntarily shares here and now in the life won by His death; by the other the individual believer voluntarily receives this life for ever: this reception is implicit in the act of faith, even the least intelligent, which touches but the hem of His garment; and explicit in the conscious concurrence of the exercised soul with its death-doom, and in its baptism into the death of Christ.

Shall not we venture a step farther and affirm in Christ a yet more thorough embodiment of the representative principle? Who can this be, whose endurance of death for all moral beings shall allow the culprits to escape, and by that escape not to think less of their God, or their sin, but to understand and consent to their merited doom? Who is it whose death shall imbue the sinner with the sinless One's horror of sin? Who can so understand sin as to express in death the Divine horror of it? Who but the everlasting Logos, the self-expression of God Himself to Himself, the bright-

ness of His Glory, the image of His Invisibility, who, upholding all things by the word of His power, makes the purification of sins and reigns as the Reconciler of creature and Creator? It is Christ the Representative.

It must not be overlooked that this principle, from the nature of the case, allows among men of acting by proxy to a much greater degree than of suffering by proxy. This is partly from the comparative rarity of the willingness to suffer for others, and partly from the impossibility in most cases of serving the purposes of the suffering, even where it can be undertaken by another. But the principle of representation remains the same in its essence and justification, whatever the extent of its range. Let it here be noted, however, that suffering merely on account of another is not representative or 'vicarious' in any strict sense of the term; it may be quite involuntary on the part of the sufferer, and in no way relieve the person whose action has brought it on. It is quite misleading to speak of such suffering as vicarious. What such suffering does show, however, is the principle of community of life and interest from which the representative principle arises—the principle, that is, by which the many act in the one, and the one for the many. Thus in theology, by means of the representative principle, we see the mercy of God finding its supreme expression in giving life to a race which has forfeited life; while His intolerance of sin finds equivalent expression in the personally undeserved death of the representative of that race. 'Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that He loved us and sent His Son to be the propitiation for our sins.' In Christ, God Himself endures His own penalty due to man. In Christ, the believer endorses the penalty He has personally escaped, God reveals to the sinner the nature of his sin; the sinner accepts the revelation; and they twain come to be of one mind in their judgment upon sin. They are *ipso facto* reconciled.

This doctrine of Representation shows the pitiful poverty of most of the figures employed to illustrate for acceptance, or to caricature for derision, the old evangelical belief on this topic. How, for example, can the 'whipping boy,' unrelated either to the royal culprit or to his disregarded tutor, set forth the Redeemer of the evangelical doctrine, the very efficacy of whose suffering depends upon his absolute identification with both parties? Even really valid illustrations of ordinary representative

action must fail to set forth that which is unique, not because it contradicts the norm, but because it includes all instances, and completely realizes the representative idea.

Here it will be of course objected that as Christ and men alike die (*i.e.* that their bodies die), His death cannot have been a penal substitution for theirs. If they themselves survive a bodily death, what should lead us to affirm that Christ underwent what they escape, or that they escape what He underwent? Whether bodily death be part of sin's penalty, or simply incident to the physical creation, what is there to differentiate the disembodiment of Christ from the disembodiment of another man? This objection, however, is virtually calling in question the previous proposition as to the really fatal character of sin. If disembodiment be not death, nor even a premonition or instalment of death, and if to the spirit no death be possible, then, of course, neither Christ nor other men ever really die. But if, on the contrary, sin is really followed by death, and if bodily death be but the external expression of the ultimate dissolution of the spirit, the whole process seeming to be incident to man's place in the physical creation, yet really being due to his failure to observe the conditions of life; then the bodily death of the Redeemer is likewise only the outward expression of an absolute tasting of death for every man, in a complete, though temporary, withdrawal of life from His very spirit, in order that they who keep His sayings might never taste of death. In this way did He indeed pour out His life unto death, when He made it an offering for sin, and made intercession for the transgressors. It is in this sense throughout that I have spoken of Death as applied to the personality of both sinner and Redeemer. It is, therefore, implied in this amended version, or, as I should prefer to style it, the completed development of the old theory of vicarious penalty, that the resurrection of Christ was essentially and primarily the revivification of His justified spirit, which had undergone death in representation of our sinful race; the resurrection of His body then becomes the fit and proper expression in the physical order, of that Immortality which He had acquired for Himself and for all who should adhere to Him, and who, in that death of His, consent to be justified. In other words, He was delivered because we had offended, and was raised because we had thus been justified. Even a purely humanitarian view of

Christ's person would admit of this representative death and resurrection from death 'by the glory of the Father,' while believers in His Divinity attribute that resurrection to His own divine virtue, even that eternal spirit, by which He once offered up Himself to God, that spirit of holiness which thereby marked Him off to be the Son of God with power. Thus of Himself He laid down His life, and thus of Himself He took it again. It is in this way that the Christian really escapes altogether that absolute forfeiture of life which is the natural issue of sin, and which was really endured by Christ alone. Thus clearly can we perceive, thus only can we defend, the essentially vicarious penal character of the Atonement.

Conclusion.—But why seek to defend this doctrine of vicarious penalty?

1. Because, if there be any force in the considerations above adduced, no other representation of penalty so fully exhibits the divine horror of sin and the necessity of righteousness as the supreme condition of life. No presentation of the uniformity and universality of moral law is so complete as that which extends its penal sanction to the sinless representative of a sinful race. Not till this fundamental relation of God to the world is vividly apprehended can men be got to care very much for the offers of Divine Love. Unmenaced by any real doom they naturally disregard what appear to be the as unreal pleadings of divine compassion. In the interests of fundamental morality we must defend the vicariously penal element in the Atonement.

2. Because, if there be any force in the considerations above adduced, no other representation of redemption so fully exhibits the exuberance of the Divine Love. So far from the doctrine implying a heathenish conception of the divine unreadiness to forgive, it sets forth the divine passion for pardon as so intense that it will endure rather than inflict the penalty due to the offender; and this, according to the Christian conception of the Redeemer, in the most acute form of loss, the death of an only-begotten. Here, as no otherwise, 'God commended His own love towards us.' Only so is the awfulness of the Divine Love set forth, and only in its awfulness does it constrain full reverence and obeisance in the human heart. In the interests of the fulness, freeness, and greatness of the Divine Love we must defend the vicariously penal element in the Atonement.

3. Because no other presentation of the Atonement so fully sets forth the purpose and wisdom of God. The superficial philosophy which represents God as needing no penal expiation, as it admits no obstacle to be overcome, so it reveals no wisdom in overcoming it, and in taking no fatal view of sin attains to no exalted view of the Divine purpose of making sin for ever after impossible by the penal expiation of the Cross, when once the story of mankind's doom and redemption has been completed. Still less can it explain the proved power of this doctrine of expiation over the hearts of men the most virtuous and the most degraded. In the interests of a solid theology and a satisfactory philosophy we are bound to defend the doctrine of a vicariously penal expiation in the Atonement.

4. Since the effect of any religious teaching on the mind and heart of man depends on the view of the Divine character exhibited, if there be truth in what has just been stated, it follows that no other view of the Atonement ultimately gives so convincing an impression of the reality of the gospel nor so moving a sense of the heinousness of sin, the certainty of pardon, the beauty of holiness, as the central conception of expiatory atonement of the Cross. The defective gospel of the Christmas Cradle has too long proved its impotency when deprived of the celestial explanation—'a Saviour which is Messiah the Lord.' As in Palestine then, so here and now, all the teachings, the warnings, the example, the manifest self-sacrifice, the works of power, the unwearied beneficence, result without the Cross in transitory crowds of those who go back and walk no more with Him, or the closer adhesion of a few who in extremity all forsake Him and flee. But let the Cradle be explained by the Cross, and all is changed. Horror

at sin, repentance on account of it, desire for amendment, acceptance of the offered reconciliation, ever increasing estimate of the depths of love involved in procuring it, awe in view of the divine wisdom, and confidence in the immutability of the divine purpose for the believing individual and for the race, are generated in the souls of men and produce an enthusiasm which shall know no rest till 'the kingdoms of this world are the kingdoms of our God and His Christ.' In the interests of the best apologetic, the best evangelism and the most ardent zeal, we must retain, defend, and exult in the doctrine of penal expiation by the Cross.

And as here, so hereafter the multitude gathered in from every kindred nation and tongue attribute the eternal whiteness of their robes to the blood of the Lamb, and acknowledge when the glory of God is filling their souls with its illumination that the light of their city is the Lamb. Their song is 'the song of Moses and the Lamb,' for the note of doom is sounded from the Cross as well as the note of the gospel; and the right to inflict that doom at last on the incorrigible is felt to belong alone to Him who has Himself endured it, for they cry, 'Worthy art Thou to open the book, for Thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us by Thy Blood.' Nor are they singular in this acknowledgment, for 'every creature which is in heaven and in the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, Blessing, honour, glory, and power be unto Him that sitteth upon the Throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever.' At the centre of creation is the Cross, and in the centre of the Cross is the doctrine of vicariously penal atonement as the supreme revelation of the heart of God.

Notes on the New Testament and the Early Church.

BY PROFESSOR W. M. RAMSAY, LL.D., D.C.L., LITT.D.

From the Fifth to the Tenth Hour.

IN *St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 271, it is maintained that when the apostle lectured daily in the school of Tyrannus from the fifth to the tenth hour, he had the use of the lecture-room of Tyrannus, after the usual work which went on there was at an end

for the day. The ordinary working day, beginning very early in the morning, ended at the fifth hour, one hour before mid-day. In *Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible*, art. 'Tyrannus,' this opinion is supported by a careful examination of the different readings and of other ways of interpreting the passage; and the conclusion is reached that (as

was tacitly assumed in the other work just quoted) Tyrannus was a teacher of philosophy in Ephesus, who used the 'school' in the morning as his lecture-room. An interesting analogy to this apportionment of the day may be quoted from an epigram of Martial, vii. 5. A certain Pompeius Auctus is there mentioned, who had to perform two kinds of duties (both of which involved the wearing of the toga); and, as Friedländer points out, and as the epigram shows clearly, these can only be a magistracy and the business of a consulting lawyer: he is described as *iure madens varioque togae limatus in usu*. As a magistrate his duties would end at the fifth hour: *in quintam varios extendit Roma labores*, Martial, iv. 8—'Rome protracts its various occupations until the fifth hour.' But it was not until the tenth hour that Auctus was free from work. Ordinary persons devoted the time between the fifth and tenth hours to the siesta, athletic exercises, the bath, and dinner—in that order regularly; and then at the tenth hour, after dinner, came the ordinary time of leisure for literary interests and listening to or reading poetry (iv. 8). Auctus, however, being set free from his official duties as a magistrate at the fifth hour, devoted the next five to his work as a consulting lawyer at his place of business (*statio*) in front of the Temple of Mars, in the Forum of Augustus. Here clients could be sure of finding him till the tenth hour. It was only at that time he was free for visitors on other matters than business, and would be ready to invite to join him at dinner any acquaintance who wished to talk about his favourite author and his favourite poems.

This example, taken from the life of a busy and hard-working lawyer, throws some light on the way in which Paul portioned out his time in Ephesus. His daily labour with his hands (Ac 20³⁴) began probably at sunrise; but the time from the fifth to the tenth hour was free for preaching and teaching; and during those hours he could hope for an audience. After the tenth hour, however willing he might perhaps be to preach, the customs of ordinary life would deprive him of listeners. Some would sacrifice their siesta to their curiosity about the lectures of this new teacher, who (as is clear from Ac 19) was widely talked about and made a centre of interest in the city: others would sacrifice their athletics or their bath, or would postpone their dinner for an hour or two in order to hear him. But by the tenth hour, even

the most eager listeners, who lingered longest, returned to their homes, and his public teaching was necessarily at an end for the day.

The question whether the Western addition 'from the fifth to the tenth hour' is original Lukan or an addition made with good knowledge (depending on correct tradition or on some other non-biblical source), is one on which I have hesitated a great deal. At first, in *St. Paul the Traveller*, I contented myself with leaving the question open, merely arguing that the fact as stated might be safely assumed to be true; I was then much more concerned to determine what was true, than what authority the truth rested on. Thereafter, in the article on 'Tyrannus,' I inclined to the view that in this passage the Western text was the true Lukan text, which had been shortened in most authorities. But, finally, in the article on 'Years, Dates, Hours,' vol. v. p. 473, I became convinced that the observation and record of divisions of time so minute as the fifth and tenth hours was not in accordance with the nature and style of Luke, in whom carelessness in observation, regard to specification of time, and chronology was a deep-seated characteristic. That there are in the Western text some, perhaps many, passages in which it preserves a trace of the original Lukan reading, lost or obscured in the generally accepted text, I have consistently maintained and believe as firmly as before. But that, as a whole, the Western text is an edition made in the second century for practical use, in which obscure words and phrases were often replaced by more easily intelligible expressions, seems to me equally certain. In many cases the Western text gives us a comment or explanation, rather than the actual words of Luke; but by its comment it shows that the text which was before the commentator was different from the accepted reading.

The Date of Polycarp's Martyrdom.

I am very glad to be in agreement with Mr. Power about the date of Polycarp's martyrdom; but when he speaks about my 'overlooking' the evidence connected with the 'great Sabbath,' he assumes that I intended to review the arguments bearing on the subject. I was quite aware that there were many arguments on this question, and hoped that I had said so clearly; but my intention was merely to point out a newly discovered fact

which, as I believe, invalidates Mr. Schmid's theory, and thereby indirectly strengthens M. Waddington's contention. As to Mr. Power's theory about the Jewish Calendar and the 'great Sabbath,' it must rank at present as one among many hypotheses, and it has to be itself proved before it can be accepted as evidence for historical events and dates. When he has convinced the authorities on that branch of study, the students of history will welcome his theory as an aid in many difficult problems; but up to the present his theory remains a mere hypothesis.

In his remarks he makes one extraordinarily erroneous statement. He declares that no Asian month contained more than 30 days, and complains that 'through neglect of this elementary principle, Lightfoot assigns 31 days to the "Asiatic" month Dios.' It is strange that a student of the Asian Calendar should be ignorant that Dios contained 31 days. That is the fact from which Mr. Power must start, and no amount of 'elementary principles' can get over it. Lightfoot has already stated (after many others) the arguments in a perfectly convincing way; and he

has since been confirmed by absolutely conclusive testimony. It is pointed out in my *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, i. p. 205, note 2, that the date 31st Dios is given in an Asian inscription of the third century after Christ. More recently, an inscription (dating a few years before Christ) giving the months of the Asian year, with the number of days in each, has been published (see *Mittheilungen des Instituts Athen.*, 1899, p. 290). The month Dios is there renamed 'Cæsar,' and is given as containing 31 days. Mr. Power must adapt his theory to the elementary facts; and, when he does this, his aid will be welcome.

As to his assertion that the calendar used in Asia in the time of Polycarp was lunar, it is so flatly contradictory of many inscriptions and much other evidence, that no person is likely to spend time in refuting it. One who makes such an assertion removes himself out of the ranks of regular progressive scholarship, and marches in a line of his own. Sometimes, of course, it is right to do so; and the scholar who is bold enough to do it ends by convincing the world. As yet Mr. Power has not convinced the world, but he has courage.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

ACTS XI. 26.

'The disciples were called Christians first in Antioch' (R.V.).

EXPOSITION.

Were called.—In earlier Greek the word used (*χρηματίζω*) denotes the transaction of business. As this involved the adoption of some style or title under which the business could be carried on, it gained in later Greek, from Polybius downwards, the sense which it bears here of being entitled so and so.—RENDALL.

Christians.—About this word two points are clear. (1) It was not employed by the Christians of themselves, 'being only found in the N.T. here, Ac 26²⁸ (contemptuously) and 1 P 4¹⁶. The 'believers' are *οἱ μαθηταί, οἱ ἅγιοι, οἱ πιστοί, οἱ ἀδελφοί*.

(2) It was not invented by the Jews, who would not apply the term 'followers of the Messiah' to those who they maintained were the followers of the man Jesus, who was *not* the Messiah. The Jews called them 'Nazarenes' or 'Galileans.'

The word is formed on the analogy of Pompeiani,

Cæsariani, and so means 'partisans' or 'followers of Christus.' It is a remarkable word, being 'written in Hebrew and Greek and Latin,' for it refers to the Hebrew belief in a Messiah, it is a Greek word, and it is formed as a Latin adjective.—PAGE.

THE keen-witted population of Antioch, already famous for their bestowal of nicknames, first used the name as popular slang, derived from the frequent use of 'Christ' in preaching and conversation. So 'Methodist' and 'Puritan' were names first given in ridicule, and then transfigured by those who bore them. Later Christianos was modified to Chrestianos. The latter means useful, helpful, and is found on some inscriptions.—PELOUBET.

First in Antioch.—Where, it seems, Christianity first showed itself distinct and free from Judaism.—COOK.

THE SERMON.

What the World called the Church, and what the Church calls itself.

By Dr. Alexander Maclaren.

Nations and parties very often call themselves by one name, and are called by outsiders by another.

Thus it was with the name Christian. It was first used by the people of Antioch, who saw that the handful of fugitives in their city, who were Jews, and were yet not Jews, must have a distinctive name, for they were a distinctive people; and so they called them Christians, or Christ's men, because they lived the life the man Christ had done, and they followed His precepts. Thus did the Antiochæans regard the matter. They believed that Christ was the proper name of a man; they did not know that it was the designation of an office. This blunder of theirs was a felicity. If they had called them 'Jesuits,' that would have meant the followers of the mere man. They did not know how much deeper they had gone when they said, not followers of Jesus, but 'followers of Christ'; for it is not Jesus the man, but Jesus Christ, the man with His office, that makes the centre and the bond of the Christian Church.

It was a great testimony to the power of the life and work of that handful of fugitives from Jerusalem that they so impressed their personality upon the frivolous and pleasure-loving men of Antioch that they had to invent a new name for them. One is almost inclined to wonder, if a few Christians to-day went and settled in, say, Pekin, whether the Chinese there would be so struck by the lives they led that they would have to invent a new name for them, and if so, whether that name would be Christians—Christ's men.

This name Christian was not, however, the name by which the Church called itself; it had nearer, dearer names—disciples, believers, saints, and brethren.

(1.) *Disciples*. When Christ was on the earth, this is the name by which His followers were known. It is used almost exclusively in the Gospels, occasionally in the Acts, but after that never. It carries us back to the beginning of Christ's ministry, when Hē was recognized as a great Rabbi, with disciples at His feet, learning always; and this attitude is a true one. He is the Teacher, the only Teacher, the Teacher for all men, the Teacher of all truth, the Teacher for evermore. But soon the name disciple fell out of use; they felt a deeper bond uniting them with Him than the bond between teacher and pupil.

(2) They were now *believers*. They exercised not merely intellectual submission to the dicta of the Teacher; they exercised living trust in the Redeemer. The belief which is faith is altogether

a higher thing than its first stage, which is the belief of the understanding. Without this trust we may be very near the Christ, but we are not *in* Him.

(3) The third name is *saints*. This name has suffered more than any of the others. By the Church it has been restricted to the dead, and by the world it has been taken to mean one who prides himself on his superiority to all others. The name saint was, however, originally applied to all Christ's followers. It had in it the idea of separation more than of purity. All who separated themselves from the world as open followers of Jesus were saints.

(4) The last name by which the members of the Church called themselves was *brethren*. This name has also suffered. The world has said that our 'brethren' signified a good deal less than their 'brothers.' 'Tis true, 'tis pity; pity 'tis, 'tis true.' When we use the word brethren, we signify that we have received new life from the Father, and that we are the brethren of all those, no matter who they are, who possess the same. It were better for us now not to ask ourselves the vague question, Am I a Christian? but rather the four questions: Am I Christ's scholar?—Am I believing on Him?—Am I consecrated to Him?—Am I the possessor of a new life?

The Imitation of Jesus Christ.

By Dean Church.

The Bible puts before us the growth of a certain type of character which we see to be the reflexion of the mind of Christ. This type of character was no imagination; it was so real that the people of Antioch had to coin a new word to express it, an ethical word denoting a definite combination of qualities, and that was Christian. In New Testament times at least, there can be no overlooking its reality and significance.

But does this type of character only exist in the New Testament; has it passed away with the old fashions, this new 'way' of thought and life, carrying the 'mind' of the Crucified to mart and synagogue and judgment seat; this strange convinced seriousness, this 'life hidden with Christ in God'; this new key to all things in the world, and all things in the human heart, new in phrase as it was new in thought, 'the love of God'; these overpowering convictions of the hope of human destiny, ending always in plain and practical

precepts for a better life—could this be, except in the fervour of a ‘first love’? Would it not degenerate as did the character of the Scribes and Pharisees?

To answer this question, we must look at the history of the Christian Church. It has not fulfilled the promise of the New Testament. There is still war in the world, and intemperance and vice, and yet through all those long nineteen centuries the Christian character has never died out, has never become out of date. Let us look briefly at a few men, separated in time, in whom the great lineaments of the Christian character appear.

Let us come down to a time about half-way between St. Paul’s days and our own, and let us take as instances of the state of spiritual life a man and a book. St. Frances of Assisi gave up his life to help the poor, the weak, the wretched. ‘He thought little of himself, even of his soul to be saved, all his life. The trouble on his mind had been what to do—how sufficiently to work for God and to help men.’ In the book, the *Imitation of Christ*, we find the same self-sacrificing ideal. ‘Set thyself, therefore, as a good and faithful servant of Christ to bear manfully the cross of thy Lord. . . . When thou hast reached to this, that trouble is sweet to thee for Christ’s sake, then believe that it is well with thee.’

Then coming down to times more near our own, we have Bishop Thomas Wilson, who wrote, ‘Where shall we take our pattern but from Thee. Grant that I may love Thee above all things, and my neighbours as myself.’ And Bishop Wilson lived as he wrote.

What is it that gives to these examples their typical character and makes them infinitely greater than the faith of Abraham, or the sanctity of John the Baptist? Surely it is the love of God in Jesus Christ—*Caritas Dei*—the love of God to man whose heart can answer to it, and who, for its sake is willing to give up his life, ‘Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends’ This it is which is the finish and crown of the Christian character, as it can be in earth; this is to have the mind of Christ, to be a Christian.

ILLUSTRATIONS.

Antioch.—The queen of the East, the third metropolis of the world, this vast city of perhaps five hundred thousand souls, must not be judged by the diminished, shrunken, and earthquake-shattered Antakieh of to-day. Its natural position on the northern slope of Mount Silpius, with a navigable river, the

broad, historic Orontes, flowing at its feet, was at once commanding and beautiful. Built by the Seleucidæ as the royal residence of their dynasty, its wide circuit of many miles was surrounded by walls of astonishing height and thickness, which had been carried across ravines and over mountain summits with such daring magnificence of conception as to give the city the aspect of being defended by its own encircling mountains, as though these gigantic bulwarks were but its natural walls. Through the entire length of the city, from the Golden or Daphne gate on the west, ran for nearly five miles a grand corso, adorned with trees, colonnades, and statues. Originally constructed by Seleucus Nicator, it had been continued by Herod the Great, who, at once to gratify his passion for architecture and to reward the people for their goodwill towards the Jews, had paved it for two miles and a half with blocks of white marble. Broad bridges spanned the river and its various affluents; baths, basilicas, villas, theatres clustered on the level plain, and, overshadowed by picturesque and rugged eminences, gave the city a splendour worthy of its fame as only inferior in grandeur to Alexandria and Rome.—F. W. FARRAR.

Christian.—It is the Christian’s privilege and duty to live up to his name that that may not be said to us which Alexander Brave said to a soldier of his own name, that was noted for a coward, ‘either change thy name or mend thy manners.’—MATTHEW HENRY.

‘Is your father a Christian?’ said a gentleman to a little boy on one occasion. ‘Yes sir,’ said the little boy, ‘but I believe he has not worked much at it lately.’—*Dublin Daily Express* (13th October 1880). The report states that the answer was received with laughter, but it does not appear that either speaker or audience saw anything strange in the question.—GEORGE SALMON.

It is not distinction, it is devotion that makes a good Christian. Not to write our name high, but to keep His Name holy, and His honour bright, is asked of apostles and of us.—R. W. BARBOUR.

WHEN Lord Peterborough lodged for a season with Fénélon, he was so delighted with his piety and virtue, that he exclaimed at parting: ‘If I stay here much longer, I shall become a Christian in spite of myself.’—J. ELLIS.

A Christian.

AND so I live, you see,
Go through the world, try, prove, reject,
Prefer, still struggling to effect,
My warfare; happy that I can
Be crossed and thwarted as a man,
Not left in God’s contempt, apart,
With ghastly smooth life, dead at heart,
Tame in earth’s paddock as her prize.
Thank God, she still each method tries
To catch me.
Thank God, no Paradise stands barred
To entry, and I find it hard
To be a Christian.—ROBERT BROWNING.

FOR REFERENCE.

Alexander (W.), *Leading Ideas of the Gospels*, 85.
 Church (R. W.), *The Discipline of the Christian Character*,
 III.
 Maclaren (A.), *A Year's Ministry*, 71.
 Maurice (F. D.), *Acts of the Apostles*, 172.

Oosterzee (J. J. van), *Year of Salvation*, vol. ii.
 Price (A. C.), *Fifty Sermons*, xi. 185.
 Ridding (G.), *The Revel and the Battle*, 328.
 Salmon (G.), *Nonmiraculous Christianity*, 31.
 Varley (H.), *Some Main Questions of the Christian
 Faith*, 114.
 Watson (A.), *Christ's Authority*, 72.

Two Oxford Teachers on the Incarnation.

BY THE REV. T. A. GURNEY, M.A., LL.B., EMMANUEL VICARAGE, CLIFTON, BRISTOL.

CHRIST CHURCH, Oxford, has contributed many invaluable aids to modern theology. Few are more valuable at the present time than the work of her late canon, the regius professor of Pastoral Theology in the University of Oxford, Robert Campbell Moberly. The present dean of Christ Church follows in his steps. But there is an interesting difference between the two men as writers. Canon Moberly possessed what has been described by Professor Sanday as 'a deductive mind.' He disclaimed great erudition. He had received remarkably the gift of insight. Intensity and depth of emotion breathe through all his words, and you are conscious of this even in the midst of a profound argument. Dean Strong is essentially 'intellectual.' He gives us, in his *Manual of Theology*, the most recent Oxford statement of Christianity as a reasoned philosophy in the light of modern scientific discoveries and modern thought. But his words are without intensity or vividness, and he travels on without passion or insight from conclusion to conclusion.

Yet it is interesting and significant to mark how entirely identical these two teachers are at least in one important respect. Each asserts the absolute supremacy of the Incarnation in relation to all Christian thought. 'The mighty fact of the Incarnation,' writes Canon Moberly, 'so absolutely dominates the entire revelation of the New Testament and characterizes and shapes all its thought and language that it is comparatively rarely that we can in the New Testament stand aside, so to speak, in thought or even in phrase from that one dominating conception' (*Atonement and Personality*, p. 185). 'As Natural Theology starts from the facts of experience in nature and the moral life,' writes Dean Strong, 'so Christian Theology starts from the Incarnation of Jesus Christ. As Natural

Theology results in an idea of God in Nature, real but bare and somewhat conjectural in character, so Christian Theology, in virtue of its new start and wider scope, ends in an idea of God which is more certain, more definite, and more coherent' (*Manual of Theology*, p. 2). The Incarnation is thus presented by both men as the starting-point of all Christian Theology, as the point round which all the revealed knowledge of God in its every aspect in relation to Nature, Man, Redemption, and the future of the Church wholly turn. It gathers up into itself all the partial revelations which precede it. It focusses them on itself, just as all the lenses in a certain powerful lighthouse pass their accumulated light on to the central lens which disperses it. It draws back upon itself all the revelations which spring out of it, and they must make their return to this one central fact in order to find their full, final, adequate interpretation there.

What can be the character of a proof adequate for a fact so tremendous? The proof is to be found in historical evidence, but the mind to receive that evidence must not be a blank. It must, says Dean Strong, use the fact it seeks to establish as both premiss and conclusion. Taking the fact as St. John does, it must analyse it and trace its full significance, and then endeavour to show the coherence of it with our previous knowledge of God and the rest of man's knowledge.¹ For the fact of the Incarnation, if true, underlies all nature, all life, all experience, and so cannot be eliminated from the discussion for a moment. In order to come to the right conclusion about it, the mind must have a sense of the unity and

¹ Cf. Forrest, *Christ of History and of Experience*: 'St. John's Gospel views the beginning of Jesus' ministry in the light of the end.'

purpose of all history. It must have a sense of proportion. 'The past and the present must be regarded as constituting one whole, or history becomes meaningless.' And then it is that we see the strength of the proof for the Incarnation. 'It centres round the Resurrection of our blessed Lord, and the Resurrection differs from other historic facts in being a living fact present still in the Church and in the hearts of believers. It is not a mere event in history, but a present and operative force among men' (Strong, p. 89). In the same spirit Forrest, in his valuable book, *The Christ of History and of Experience*, remarks that 'the verification of Christianity is exceptional, for its historic fact is not an isolated event or saying, but a Personality, and a Personality of unparalleled type' (p. 314).

But, in spite of evidence which appears to Christian minds so convincing, the question has been asked, Is not such a fact as the Incarnation *a priori* impossible? In other words, Is not God bound by the order of the world which He has made? The strength of the negative answer lies, says Dean Strong, in the fact that the physical world is utilized and managed by spiritual forces, and that the notion of end or purpose is necessary to the rational interpretation of the world. The order of Nature is, therefore, a moral rather than a merely physical order. It demands something higher than itself. Thus the Incarnation becomes the true and necessary consummation of the natural order. For, though it is true that God cannot change His purpose, it is not true that He cannot purpose a change. And we have no right to be sure that physical uniformity exhausts the purpose of God (Strong, p. 67). There is much more to be known about Him than the order of Nature could possibly reveal. Hence we have miracles. In them, 'God, retaining unchanged His purpose of self-revelation, adapts the physical order to it in a way which, from the point of view of that physical order, is strange and startling, but, from the point of view of the will of God and of that wider view of nature which covers all His self-manifestations through the world, they are natural enough' (Strong, p. 68).

The Incarnation, thus regarded, 'is in organic continuity with the progress of the world.' 'There is no violent, unnatural breach with the past.' 'It fulfils, it does not destroy.' It fits in with the idea, expressed in Evolution, of advance from the

simple to the more complex, till human life and society, morality and religion, emerge at the end. Even looking at evolution from the standpoint of purely physical order, the Incarnation is necessary to remedy failure at a particular point. For 'the whole is a gradually intensifying manifestation of Himself by God,' and the climax is not reached in man, but in

That God which ever lives and loves,
One God, One Law, One Element,
And one far-off divine event
To which the whole creation moves.

On the other hand, if we look at the purely moral conception of Nature, 'by which Nature is regarded as a great appeal to man, a great manifestation of purpose and love,' here, again, the Incarnation of Christ is a climax; it gathers up into itself all that has gone before and explains the early stages of the process (Strong, p. 72). 'Grant that the purpose of God is to reveal Himself to man, and then the gathering together the broken lights into the Person of the Light of the World involves no spasmodic change of will, no sudden veering of purpose, but only alters, and alters for good, the views men might have entertained before' (p. 72). If, then, the Incarnation thus fulfils the natural order and the natural aspirations of man, there is no *a priori* impossibility about it. It may be accepted upon historic evidence.

The truth of the Incarnation gives us insight into the Being of God at the same time that it throws light upon the destiny of man. It is indeed only through this fact that we can approach the truth of the Holy Trinity at all. 'The Christian doctrine of the Holy Trinity represents the effect of the Incarnation on the doctrine of the true God. If the Incarnation in the Christian sense be true, the doctrine of the Holy Trinity is true also' (Strong, p. 136). For, without the revelation contained in it, all speculation upon God may become anthropomorphic. The most philosophic theory of His nature may be as anthropomorphic as the most crude. Though the late Herbert Spencer made merry over mediæval representations of the Holy Trinity, yet 'it may be doubted whether his Infinite, Eternal, and Unknowable Power is less anthropomorphic.' The conception of *time* as applied to God is our greatest danger. But, as the truth of the Incarnation consists in the eternal generation of the Son before all time, His entry

into time is no longer an essential feature of His being.

Again, we think of each Divine Person as He is unfolded to us in and through the Incarnation. When we think of God the Son it is not as the uncreated Word; it is as the Word made flesh tabernacling among us, as the Life become the Light of men. Thus, through the Incarnation, the Person of God the Word is revealed to men. And it is the same with God the Holy Spirit. 'It is,' writes Canon Moberly (*Atonement and Personality*, p. 181), 'as sequel and consummation of the accomplished completeness of the Incarnation that the doctrine of the Holy Spirit begins to be unveiled to man's thought at all; as sequel, because the manifestation of the Holy Ghost must follow, and could not precede, the Incarnate Life of God; as consummation, because the significance and work of Incarnation and Atonement would be, after all, without the presence of the Holy Ghost (that is, the presence of God as Spirit within Man's central self), incomplete.' Thus the doctrine of the Holy Trinity is revealed to us in connexion with, and in terms of, the Incarnation. Not that for a moment we believe that God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost have not an eternal distinctness as Three Persons in One God *apart* from that fact, but that only *through* the Incarnation can their being be truly brought home to us. And thus we come, at least dimly, to realize how Personality can be realized in a glorious sense far beyond all those thoughts of limitation and exclusion which we associate with human personality; how there may be Three Persons in One supreme, glorious fulness of Personality; how God as Spirit, as Light, as Love can be eternally self-sufficient in a Divine Fellowship, of perfect mutuality, which has no lack of subject and object and relation, and yet find in the law of His being a motive for the creation of the world, that man may share His glories. And we can see also how through all the ages God has been entering through the Word into Nature, how 'that which hath been made is life in Him' (St. John 1³, marg. R.V.); how all nature in all its developments has been instinct with the presence of a God immanent yet transcendent; how the final manifestation of God the Word in human flesh has been 'from the ages of the ages' the final cause of Creation, the splendid destiny reserved, even apart from the Fall, for man, the great climax towards which all its natural

evolutions as well as its supernatural crises have been tending.

But as a matter of fact, as the old Sarum collect has it, man is 'bowed down under the yoke of the ancient bondage of sin' and 'cast down by the guilt of his own deeds.' And it is when we view the Incarnation in the shadow of the Fall that it means most to us. For that Fall is a historic fact, affirmed by all Scripture, and not by one narrative only, and confirmed by the deepest facts of man's nature. The present form of that narrative may possibly in its scenery be allegorical, may even have sprung in some respects from Babylonian legend. But it is still the historic account of man's collapse. Even the form which the Temptation is represented as taking has nothing incredible or impossible about it (Strong, p. 243). Bishop Westcott once wrote that there is no view of human nature so hopeless as that which denies the Fall. Holy Scripture is borne out by man's own instincts when it denies that evil is necessary and teaches us to regard it as an avoidable tragedy for which man himself is responsible, 'Conscience convicts,' says Dean Strong, 'not of mistake, not of inevitable delusion, but . . . of sin.' Original sin is the affirmation of the fact, to which science is bearing an ever fuller testimony, of the power of heredity and the solidarity of the whole human race.

Sin came and man died. Christ came and man lived again. 'The evidence of the Bible is certain and clear (1) upon the necessity of a breach in the old connexion—in the sinful succession of mankind; (2) and also in the fact that this breach actually took place' (Strong, p. 270). 'The Word of God eternally generated and of one substance with the Father, for us men and for our salvation came down from Heaven and was made man.' Being more than man He could take on all human nature. This humanity of God is more and more the thought upon which the faith and hopes of men are converging. (See Van Dyke's *Gospel for an Age of Doubt*, c. iv.) And this is the claim which Christ makes to the faith and love of men. 'It is not because He is the best of men that humanity bows before Him as the Son of God, but just because, being the best of men, He is also something more, and can do for it what none other can. His transcendence of human experience alike in His life, death, and resurrection in one way isolates Him from us. But it is this very transcendence

which is the condition of our finally reaching His blessedness. Christianity is not an idealism; it is an achievement' (Forrest, *Christ of History and of Experience*).

The Incarnate One entered thus into our whole human nature. He became man, archetypal, universal, representative man, free from all particularities and peculiarities of race or age or station. 'Man of the substance of His mother, born in the world,' gathering up into Himself all the characteristics of our common humanity, ideally and perfectly man, in perfect fellowship with the Father, in perfect sympathy with fallen man. He thus 'recapitulated humanity' (Strong, p. 276). Thus, only thus, could He reveal the present degradation, the future possibilities, the everlasting destiny of human nature. Thus, only thus, could He atone for sin by the sacrifice of Himself. And this He

did when, upon the Cross, He dealt with *Sin*, offering what man could not offer, the perfect penitence of the sinless One, thus restoring man's will into harmony with that of His Father; when, again, on the Cross He dealt with *Guilt*, demonstrating the righteousness of God in punishing sin and thus securing the sinner's forgiveness which he himself could not secure; when, on the Cross again, He dealt with *Sanctification*, through the outpoured Blood ('wherein is the life'), releasing the life which is the secret of man's cleansing and man's renewal, bringing home to us the gift of the Spirit whereby man is awakened to his true possibilities. For, though 'Pentecost could not be without Calvary,' and 'Calvary is the possibility of Pentecost,' yet 'Pentecost is the realization, in human spirits, of Calvary' (*Atonement and Personality*, p. 152).

Recent Biblical and Oriental Archaeology.

BY PROFESSOR A. H. SAYCE, LL.D., OXFORD.

Who was Balaam?

BALAAAM is a puzzling figure. He comes before us under different aspects which are not very easy to harmonize. He is (1) a diviner from Pethor, who, like the Aramæans, Bethuel and Laban, serves Yahweh of Israel; (2) an ally, apparently, of the Midianites in Moab in their contest with the Israelites (Nu 31⁸), who is identified with the diviner in Jos 13²²; and (3) the first king of Edom, who fixed his capital at Dinhabah (Gn 36³²).

His name has been compared with that of Balummê, the father of the Canaanite Sum-Hadad, who is mentioned in the Tel el-Amarna tablets (WINCKLER, II. 18). Winckler would identify Balummê with Pâlûma, who is described by the Egyptian king as living in the land of the Amorites, north of Palestine. Pâlûma, however, whose name should rather be read Pâlûwa, is the Amorite Pâluya referred to in another letter (WINCKLER, 47. 9). Balummê may be non-Semitic, since we find Pastummê with a similar termination among the Alasiyan names given in the Tel el-Amarna correspondence (WINCKLER, 26. 21), and the same termination is found in Hittite names. It is quite

possible that Balaam, abbreviated into Bela on the analogy of Milcom and Moloch, may have been an attempt to give the foreign name a Semitic appearance.

Balaam, the diviner, came from Pethor, which was a Hittite city at the confluence of the Euphrates and Sajur. It is described as being 'by the river of the land of the children of Ammo,' the Ammi of the Tel el-Amarna tablets, which is also mentioned in two of the Hittite inscriptions of Hamath. It was one of the Hittite conquests of which the Tel el-Amarna letters contain a record. Now in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for March I have pointed out that in the Tel el-Amarna age the leaders of Hittite *condottieri* carved out principalities for themselves, like the Normans in the Middle Ages, not only in Syria but in Southern Palestine as well. Is it not possible, therefore, that Balaam, the son of Beor, was one of these Hittite chieftains who made his way into Edom, and there founded a kingdom? When the Exodus took place, the Edomites were still governed by native *alâphim* or 'dukes' (Ex 15¹⁵); when the Israelites were preparing to invade Canaan, Edom had passed under the rule of a king (Nu 20¹⁴). That the first king of Edom

should have perished in a war carried on by Israel against the Midianites in Moab has nothing improbable in it when we remember that the third king of Edom 'smote Midian in the field of Moab' (Gn 36⁸⁵), and that the sword of a successful leader of *condottieri* would naturally be at the service of his neighbours if they could pay him for it. At the time of the Exodus, the Midianites were already occupying a part of Moab (see Nu 22⁴⁻⁷).

Dr. Neubauer once suggested (I think in the *Academy*) that Dinhabah is a Semitized form of Dunip, the famous fortress-city of northern Syria, near Aleppo, and that it was so named by Balaam after the better-known city of the north. If this suggestion has any truth in it, it would be additional evidence in favour of the Hittite origin of the first Edomite king.

That Edom suddenly became formidable during the period which elapsed between the Exodus and the Israelitish invasion of Canaan, has already been inferred by Egyptologists. For the first and last time in Egyptian history Ramses III. made a campaign against 'the people of Seir,' and 'plundered their tents.' This was after the repulse of the Philistines and other invaders of Egypt from the Greek seas, and the capture of Hittite and Amorite princes who had penetrated into Canaan and even to the Egyptian frontier. One of them may very easily have found his way as far as the mountains of Seir. How a Hittite chieftain came

to be also a diviner still remains to be explained. Perhaps a key to the problem may be discovered in the words of Balaam (Nu 23⁷), that he had been brought 'from Aram, out of the mountains of the East.' The East was the home of magic and wisdom, and the highest praise accorded to Solomon was that his 'wisdom excelled the wisdom of all the east country (literally the children of the East) and all the wisdom of Egypt' (1 K 4³⁰).

Inter Alia.

Professor Schiaparelli has discovered the tomb of Nefert-ari, the favourite wife of Ramses II., in the Valley of the Tombs of the Queens, at Thebes. Though the mummy of the queen has disappeared, the tomb itself is in a good state of preservation, and the inscriptions on the walls are numerous and legible.

At Karnak M. Legrain has found a pit filled with statues of all ages, from one of the Sixth dynasty down to others of the Græco-Roman period. It is supposed that they were thrown into the pit when the pagan temples were closed by Theodosius. One of the statues is a portrait of Usertesen III. of the Twelfth dynasty, and represents him with features which are Hyksos rather than Egyptian. It would seem, therefore, that a strain of Asiatic blood must have entered the royal house of Egypt long before the days of the Hyksos invasion.

Point and Illustration.

So wonderful, so supernatural, is the story of Madagascar, that it is difficult to believe it is true. It is more wonderful than the story of Japan. There is less of man and more of God in it. The whole range of Christian experience has been accomplished there. Its history is a miniature of the history of Christianity. As Mr. Matthews says,¹ there is no count in that terrible first chapter of the Epistle to the Romans that was not true of the conduct of the native Malagasy. Every item of St. Paul's catalogue of sufferings was repeated in the case of the missionaries. And the light and liberty that came at last came in all the flood of the convulsions of apostolic days.

¹ *Thirty Years in Madagascar*. By the Rev. T. T. Matthews. R.T.S., 1904. Price 6s.

Mr. Matthews has produced a great book. It is quite in touch with its great theme. He has spent thirty years in the island, and knows it well. Yet he has spared no pains to make his book attractive to the uninterested. The style is easy, the illustrations are many, lifelike, and appropriate. To read the book is to be at home in a strange land. Here is one of its scenes—

The Sheep's Rump.—I was six years in Madagascar before I had to perform the marriage ceremony for any of our people. We found the vast majority of the church members and adherents married, and those of the latter who were not could not be persuaded to follow the Christian mode of marriage. They said our agreement was too hard, it was till death. We might take our wives till death, because they were wise and good; but as their women were foolish and bad, they could not consent to take them until

death. Their view of marriage was that of their own proverb, which says that marriage is like marketing—if the parties don't agree, they just separate.

At last one of my deacons, who was a widower, wished to marry again, and he asked me to perform the marriage ceremony. We had the marriage in the station church one Sabbath morning at the close of the service. The deacon and his bride stood up in front of the rail, and I began reading the marriage service. At one part of it I had to ask the usual question—*Efa lāsa va ny vōdīndry?* i.e. Has the sheep's rump gone?

In former times quarrels seem to have been made up, and serious agreements concluded, over the carcase of a slain animal, after which a feast followed (Gn 31⁴¹⁻⁵⁵). Perhaps the marriage agreement was made or concluded over the carcase of a sheep, after which the hinder-quarters may have been handed over to the father and mother of the bride, or her guardians, and the reception by them of *ny vōdīndry* in the presence of witnesses made the marriage legal. It afterwards came about that a small piece of money took the place of the hinder quarters of the sheep; but that still retained the name of *ny vōdīndry*, 'the sheep's rump,' and the reception of that by the father and mother of the bride, or by her guardians, constituted the marriage legal. Not that there was much in the legality; for a man might divorce his wife at any time by simply saying to her, 'Thanks, go!' She could not divorce him, but he could divorce her at any time. We had to ask, therefore, while reading the marriage service, if the legal transaction had taken place, because, if not, we could not go on with the service till it had.

My wife had never read the Malagasy marriage service, I don't think she even knew about the *vōdīndry*; certainly she did not know that we had to ask in the marriage service if that had gone or been received; and hence, when I called out in the middle of the service, '*Has the sheep's rump gone?*' the look of surprise and horror which came over her face was a thing to be remembered. I suspect she feared I had taken leave of my senses.

It would be wise if the great Missionary Societies continued to tell the story of the Boxer riots till the whole world knew it. For there is one word which every page keeps spelling, 'Jesus lives.' Not for any dead Christ, not for any absentee God, would those men and women have gone cheerfully to the death. They counted the loss of all things but dung because they had Christ. The new book¹ is most handsome. Its portraits will go down to posterity in school-books. 'These are the men and women,' Christian China will say in the day of its redemption, 'who died for us, through the love of Christ which constrained them.' And it is not those who died only, though it is a great multitude, who will be remembered.

¹ *The China Martyrs of 1900*. Compiled and edited by R. C. Forsyth. R.T.S., 1904. Price 7s. 6d.

There were some who suffered. Here is a bit out of Mrs. Ogren's narrative—

In Deaths oft.—God only knows the horror and misery of those hours. We had been hoping there would be a turn for the better, but matters only got worse. Here lay my poor delirious husband, who had so lately been strong and cheerful; there our baby, the picture of health and admiration of all when we left home, now a mere living skeleton, lay with his little head rolling down limply on his shoulder, and I—well for me I could not see my own face, and surely there would be little comfort in the sight. My bitter cup of suffering was now full almost to running over. After that awful night my husband seemed to get a little better. I rejoiced to be able to loose his bonds, and in a few days we could join in prayer, and take sweet counsel together from my precious treasure, the Bible; my eyes began to grow better, and the baby too kept improving. How we prayed—I alone, or when my husband's mind was clear enough, both together—that God would end our sufferings and bring us once more among our friends. Now we longed for peace as earnestly as when hidden in the caves of Shensi we longed for the roar of foreign guns.

I was now buying only one bowl of milk per day, and used the other fifty cash to buy meat for my husband's dinner. The jailer scolded me for spending my money on meat. The official also cautioned me several times against wasting money. I longed for some other nutritious food for my husband in his weakness. Once he looked so longingly at baby's milk, and asked to taste it. But though I wished to give him milk, we could afford only one bowl a day to keep Samuel alive. If I had suspected how near his end my husband was, I would have gone at the risk of my life to the official and begged him to help me get more suitable food, and, if possible, save the poor flickering life. As it was, I began giving part of our rice for a little more milk to give my husband. This meant robbing myself of needed food. Still another blow came upon us, when the official, hearing the use I was making of the rice, stopped giving it, and we had only the one hundred cash per day to feed three of us. A few days later our milkman disappeared, as the official had told him not to come. The prison den became intolerable to me. Harder than all the weariness and starvation for me to bear were the filth and vermin. Only those who have been through it know the torture of these swarms of creeping, biting vermin. And the sight of them, added to the tortures of my helpless, suffering dear ones, was horrible to me. The sight of them in such a condition, and I with no chance to care for them in a clean, cheerful place, brought scalding tears to my eyes. But I sought and found comfort from God in prayer. What rest of soul, when for a few moments I could close my eyes to the miseries which surrounded me, and look up to the 'God of all comfort!'

From every stormy wind that blows,
From every swelling tide of woes,
There is a calm, a sure retreat—
'Tis found beneath the mercy-seat.

Mr. John Horne has read much and marked his books as he read. Now he has copied out the

paragraphs or sentences he had marked, given them headings, and got Messrs. Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier to publish the volume. He calls it *Starting Points* (crown 8vo, 2s. 6d. net). Here is a taste of it in three of its shortest quotations—

Superficial Impressions are Deepest.—‘The very word “superficial” is founded on a fundamental mistake about life, the idea that second thoughts are best. The superficial impression of the world is by far the deepest. What we really feel, naturally and casually, about the look of skies and trees and the face of friends—that, and that alone, will almost certainly remain our vital philosophy till our dying day.’—G. K. CHESTERTON.

First Beliefs are Abiding.—‘Whatever the theology about which a man argues and contends, it is the theology of his childhood upon which he acts.’—JOHN ACKWORTH.

Toleration, a Positive Principle.—‘Toleration is far more than the abandonment of civil usurpations over conscience; it means *reverence for all the possibilities of truth.*’—JOHN MORLEY.

Mr. Horne is utterly tolerant. If Mr. Zangwill advocates Judaism well, Mr. Zangwill shall be quoted. He wants to make us begin thinking, not to give us orthodox systems—

Judaism more Practical than Christianity.—Christianity has become impracticable. Now, the Jewish religion was never impossible, but always serene and useful, even in the details of life. The Jew never accepted the doctrine of self-abnegation; he never regarded life as a sacrifice. Browning’s philosophy in this respect approaches most nearly to the Jewish religion. Christianity is a very beautiful thing for special saintly souls, but it will never touch the masses. Christians have one religion which they preach, and another which they live.—ZANGWILL.

Dante and Browning, Browning and Dante; if it is not the one it is the other; not a month passes but some book appears upon them. There is always the risk that we read the books about them, and not Dante and Browning themselves. If we would use the books as buoys, for it does need some buoying up to learn to swim in Dante and in

Browning, and then when we can swim a little throw them away. Mr. Flew’s book¹ would serve the purpose of the lifebuoy well. It is all about Browning, none of it about Mr. Flew, and it does give confidence and some knowledge. The chapters are headed, ‘Concerning the Soul,’ ‘Concerning Faith,’ ‘Concerning Life,’ and so on. Out of the whole of the works the relevant passages are gathered, and strung upon a narrative of simple explanation.

In the chapter on the soul Mr. Flew touches on Browning’s view of the body—

Browning on the Body.—When Archbishop Whately was dying, his chaplain read to him the eighth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, and then quoted the words from the Epistle to the Philippians (iii. 20-1): ‘We look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall change *our vile body,*’ etc. The dying man was pained, and asked for ‘the right thing’ to be read to him. The chaplain then repeated it again, with the rendering with which we are now familiar in the Revised Version: ‘Who shall fashion anew *the body of our humiliation.*’ ‘That is right,’ said the Archbishop, ‘there is nothing vile which God has made.’

Such, I think, was Robert Browning’s view of the material body. Under some conditions he does not hesitate to give it precedence over the soul. Thus—

‘Not bread alone,’ but bread before all else
For these: the bodily want serve first, said I;
If earth-space and the life-time help not here,
Where is the good of body having been?
But, helping body, if we somewhat baulk
The soul of finer fare, such foods to find
Elsewhere and afterward.

Nor does he scruple to say in *Rabbi Ben Ezra*—

Let us not always say
‘Spite of this flesh to-day
I strove, made head, gained ground upon the whole!’
As the bird wings and sings,
Let us cry ‘All good things
Are ours, nor soul helps flesh more, now, than
Flesh helps soul!’

¹ *Studies in Browning.* By Josiah Flew. Kelly. Crown 8vo, pp. 240, 2s. 6d. net.

Recent Foreign Theology.

A Thoroughgoing Realist.¹

THE author of this philosophical treatise is a nephew of the late Dr. Charles Hodge of Princeton, to whose memory the work is affectionately dedicated. It aims at developing on thoroughgoing lines a philosophy of realism, by which the contrary theory of idealism, as well as all systems of materialism, pantheism, agnosticism, and anti-theistic evolution will be subverted from the foundation. Like his distinguished uncle, the author is not averse from mixing up philosophy and theology, and his philosophical discussions proper alternate with arguments drawn from revelation, and with biblical expositions. In other respects he severs himself from the Scottish school, as represented by Hamilton and McCosh, and commits himself to positions to which the bulk of realists—even, we imagine, Dr. Hodge himself—would by no means assent. It is these peculiar contentions, we infer, which entitle the book to be called 'a new philosophy.' But it is in this region, we think, the author overshoots his mark, and fails to make good his case. In many parts of the argument, indeed, there is exhibited distinct subtlety of thinking, and the discussions on time and space, identity, sub-consciousness, and similar metaphysical problems, are marked by not a few original suggestions. Often the author hits a nail on the head by a happy phrase, as when he says: 'It is an abuse of language and confusion of thought to say we believe because we know; if we already know there is no room and no need for belief' (p. 9).

The author's general position may be best stated in his own words: 'Our fundamental thought or truth is that of Thoroughgoing Realism. There is a real God; a real universe; we are real beings; we have a real knowledge of God, of ourselves, of one another, of things; and the origin of our knowledge is Consciousness, Intuition, our cognizing the things which are, which consciousness is infallible' (p. 40). But in working out this general position he goes, as already said, far beyond the

ordinary realism of the schools. His boldest innovation is the absolute denial of the distinction between primary and secondary qualities, and the assertion, which a large part of his book is spent in elaborating and defending, that colour, sound, perfume, flavour, warmth, etc., are not, as is commonly allowed, feelings or sensations—*i.e.* belong to the subjective side of experience—but are 'objective material realities,'—part of the actual world we cognize, and not dependent for their existence on our perceptions of them (pp. 152, 291, etc.). To maintain this is, in the author's view, the only effectual way of rebutting idealism (pp. 159, 202, etc.). If it were really so, we fear the answer would have to be, 'So much the worse for realism.' If warmth, *e.g.* or the sensation of burning, is not a feeling, what is it? Is heat *in that sense* in the poker? Can redness, melodious sounds, tastes, odours, etc., be intelligibly conceived of as anything but conscious states?

In much of his argument Mr. Hodge has got hold of a true idea, but he pushes it to extremes which involve him in inconsistencies. His starting-point and fundamental thesis is the 'infallibility of consciousness.' It is true that we can get no deeper ground of certainty than ultimate facts of consciousness; true also that what we are conscious of, we *are* conscious of. But consciousness in the developed mind is a highly complex product, as the author is elsewhere aware (pp. 98, 280, etc.), and when its testimony to reality is in question, very careful analysis has to be made to discriminate between primary and derived elements. He objects strongly to 'intuitive judgments,' holding these to be really 'intuitive cognitions' (p. 15). But 'cognition' in his sense includes judgments, and must do so. In speaking of identity, he says: 'The definite and infallible affirmation of consciousness is "*I am and I continue to be*"' (p. 78). But that is a judgment. His principal contention, however, is, 'that there are two substances, or entities, the material and the spiritual' (p. 58). The late Professor A. B. Bruce once said to us in criticism of Hegelianism: 'I do not see why there should not be two "things."'
Mr. Hodge is of the same opinion, but it is not clear now, even on his own theory, the two 'things' are got at. He tells us that we do not know

¹ *Intuitive Perception presented by a New Philosophy of Natural Realism in Accordance with Universally Accepted Truths.* By William Henry Hodge. Lancaster, Penn.: The Wickersham Press, 1903. 477 pages.

'substance' except by its attributes; it is not therefore immediately given, and must be arrived at by inference—'an intuitive judgment.' But the chief puzzle is about the object. If I feel a pain in my finger, where do I feel it? Mr. Hodge rejects the ordinary doctrine of a brain sensorium, and says the soul is omnipresent in the body; the pain is felt therefore in the very spot—the finger (pp. 161 ff.). What, then, of the man whose leg has been amputated, but who still has the sensation of pain in his toes? Again, when I perceive an external object, what is it I really see or feel? The general tenor of Mr. Hodge's exposition would lead us to reply—the *very outward object*. 'As we are conscious of the reality of our own being and of the real being of the things of "self" and "not-self,"' he says, 'that is of these things *themselves as they actually are* (italics his), there is no room nor possibility for error in such knowledge' (p. 200). The senses 'do not come within the sphere or range of our consciousness as to the cognition of external realities. The statements made exclude such sensations, positively deny them' (p. 201). But when objections have to be met (as the bent stick, an extinguished star, etc.), the doctrine apparently changes. 'That which is immediately perceived by sight,' we are told, 'is the Picture on the Retina. This is the objective reality cognized, and it is *this cognition* which is infallibly true' (p. 272). We have, indeed, the explanation: 'In cognizing the phenomena on the retina, we cognize, not a picture or representation of it, but the *very phenomena itself, which, being at a distance, is carried into the eye*. . . . Thus it is actually true, that we see the distant external reality, *its very self*' (pp. 229, 250). The 'reality,' then, proves to be at most a light-image, and instead of looking on the mountain a mile off on the horizon, we are viewing an infinitesimal reproduction of it on the retinal surface! For it remains true: 'The object *seen* is nothing but the colour' (p. 229; cf. p. 236). So with the other qualities. This is as far from the *dictum* of the naïve consciousness as that light and colour are affections of the soul. And the problem is unsolved how from simple colour we get the ideas of objective, self-subsisting objects—the idea even of a retina itself to receive the impression. How do we get the idea of 'substances'?

Mr. Hodge has made a brave attempt to establish his new doctrine of realism, but we are

afraid that the general judgment will be that he has set himself to defend a paradox—if not a contradiction.

JAMES ORR.

Cyprian's Letters.¹

HANS FREIHERR VON SODEN dedicates his first book—an elaborate and learned inquiry into the history of the origin and transmission of Cyprian's Letters—to his father, whose critical commentaries are highly valued by New Testament students. This work was undertaken at the suggestion of Dr. Harnack, and is one of many proofs of the stimulating influence of his example on younger scholars.

In an interesting introduction the author directs attention to the widespread use of Cyprian's writings for purposes of edification, even before they became prominent in theological controversies. 'Bishop Lucifer of Calaris made use in his tracts of nothing but the Holy Scriptures and the writings of Cyprian.' The absence of any historical monograph on Cyprian's use of Scripture is, in von Soden's judgment, a cause for regret, as it is a theme which would amply repay a careful student. In modest language the purpose of this work is described—it is intended to be a contribution towards the history of Cyprian literature. The manuscripts neither present the same collection of letters nor arrange them in the same order; it is necessary, therefore, to undertake the laborious task of comparing the different collections, and of investigating other valuable evidence, including the quotations from Cyprian in the writings of the later Fathers of the Church.

A footnote to a useful list of the Letters of Cyprian says that Dr. Sanday incorrectly describes Ep. 23 and Ep. 47. Von Soden places Ep. 23—*Univerſi confessores Cypriano papati*—under the heading '*lapsi*,' and Ep. 47—*Cyprianus Cornelio fratri*—under the heading, '*Novatianisches Schisma*.' A careful chronological table takes Pearson's and Hartel's enumeration (P.H.) as a basis, and gives in parallel columns the order adopted by Pamelius, Ritschl, Nelke, and von Soden. The conclusions arrived at are—that the

¹ *Die cyprianische Briefsammlung*. Geschichte ihrer Entstehung und Ueberlieferung von Hans Freiherr von Soden. M. 10. 50. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs.

traditional form of the Letters is not original; that numerous copies of the Letters were circulated in Cyprian's life; that Cyprian himself prepared compendia of his letters (von Soden claims to have discovered proof of this in hitherto unnoticed words of Cyprian (Ep. 27⁴)); that in the lifetime of Cyprian his letters had a place in the devotional or edificatory literature of the Church; that the collections of letters were originally intended to comprise only Cyprian's—the inclusion of non-Cyprianic letters is, therefore, to be regarded as exceptional; that those writings of Cyprian which are known to us, though they have not been preserved, were lost at a very early date; that the chronological order of the letters cannot be learnt from tradition, but must be reconstructed.

In the second part of his book, von Soden gives an account of the number, contents, age, etc., of the various manuscripts. They are 'extraordinarily numerous'; many are never referred to in the literature which deals with the subject, and comparatively few have been used to determine the text. In great detail the author proceeds to discuss various attempts to arrange the manuscripts in groups, so as to distinguish codices which represent archetypes from those which contain internal evidence of being dependent types.

It is impossible, in a brief notice, to give more than a general idea of the thoroughness of this work; it contains a mass of material, conveniently arranged, which will be invaluable to all who are interested in the subject of von Soden's learned researches. He traces Cyprian's Letters from the time when they were written to the publication of the latest edition of them. He gives reasons for believing that political considerations led Cyprian to arrange for the distribution of his letters 'in bundles.' He thinks that the oldest collection of the letters was intended for the use of confessors and martyrs, and next in order of time he places the collection which owed its origin to the strife with heretics.

Appendices furnish a complete bibliography, catalogues of the manuscripts extant and lost, dissertations on the genuine *Libelli*, on the *Opera spuria*, etc. Tables, which are a marvel of ingenuity and industry, reveal to those who master the key the genealogy of the manuscripts.

J. G. TASKER.

Handsworth College.

A Study of the Roman Epistle.¹

DR. FEINE's discussion of the problems, great and small, raised by the Roman Epistle is very independent and thorough. The author does not make the mistake of letting us know everybody's theory but his own. His own solution is always well to the front, other explanations serving to give illustration and point. After a brief introduction indicating the author's view of the general drift and purport of the Epistle, the views of Zahn, Spitta, B. Weiss, Pfeiderer, Weizsäcker, and Jülicher, as the most recent writers, are succinctly sketched; and then in successive chapters the main points in the position advocated are discussed in detail, such as the Gentile-Christian character of the Roman Church, Paul's attitude to his own nation in the Epistle, the attitude of believing and unbelieving Judaism to the apostle, Paul's gospel represented as intended for Gentile Christians, and yet friendly to the Jews, with incidental admonition to the Gentile-Christian Romans who were inclined to despise unbelieving Israel. A separate chapter discusses Spitta's peculiar suggestions. The fourth of the sections just mentioned forms the main body of the treatise. The section is an extended analysis of the contents of the Epistle in the interest of the author's theory under every aspect. Even where the discussion is not convincing, it is full of striking suggestions.

The main question in deciding the object of the Epistle is of course the composition of the Roman Church to which the Epistle was sent. The author takes the common view that it was chiefly Gentile-Christian, with a sprinkling of Jewish believers, although here he is opposed by so great an authority as Zahn, who reverses the order of the two constituent elements. Even the Jewish Christians at Rome were not Judaizers. The special polemic of the Galatian Epistle is quite wanting. The author abundantly proves that the controversy of the Roman letter is with unbelieving Jews. In arguing against Zahn's thesis, he relies not only upon particular passages, but upon the entire tenor and substance of the teaching. 'All the nations' (1⁵) Feine takes to be 'all the Gentile nations,' in accordance with Paul's Gentile

¹ *Der Römerbrief, Eine exegetische Studie.* Von D. Paul Feine, Prof. der ev. Theologie in Wien. Göttingen, 1903. Price 5s.

apostleship, and he has no difficulty in showing that the interpretation is borne out by other passages. It is significant that the picture of the world's sin in the first chapter is a picture of the heathen world. 'Had the Romans been Jewish Christians, Paul as apostle would not have done otherwise than characterize their own pre-Christian sinful life in the first place, or even alone.' The fact that, in his account of universal sin, Paul in the second chapter turns aside to argue with unbelieving Jews, for what he says does not apply to Judaizing Christians, may be explained by supposing that he is taking the side of the Roman Christians against Jewish attacks, and putting weapons into their hands. In 11¹³, Paul says, 'I speak to you that are Gentiles' ('to you' emphatic). It might seem as if he were distinguishing between a Gentile and Jewish section of the Roman Church. But this cannot be, because in the entire context he is speaking of Israel and the Gentiles as the two great divisions of mankind, and here especially of the distinction between unbelieving and believing Gentiles. Feine also remarks that if Paul's object had been to commend his Gentile mission to Jewish Christians at Rome, his argument in chaps. 1-3 is ill adapted for the purpose. To argue that Gentiles might keep the law better than Jews was not the way to conciliate the latter.

At the same time there is ample evidence of a Jewish-Christian minority at Rome. In view of the reference to distinctions of clean and unclean food, and distinctions of days, the 'weak' can only have been Jews, and the 'strong' Gentiles. The latter are evidently the majority. In 4¹, the apostle speaks as a born Jew to born Jews. 'Paul was a Jew, and never ceased to feel himself one. The history of mankind is to him even in the Roman letter, a history of the Jewish people. This shows itself plainly in chaps. 9-11, where the Gentiles appear simply as the means and instrument by which God's purposes with Israel are accomplished.' In this very Epistle, where he grinds the arguments and objections of Jews to powder, he again and again speaks of the prerogatives of Israel, and protests his affection for his kinsmen (9⁴ 3¹). In the striking simile of the wild olive, he warns the Christians at Rome against contempt of the Jew. See also 12³, 16. The point constantly insisted upon by Paul, that the gospel is simply the fulfilment of O.T. promise,

while it disproves the Jewish position, reminds the Gentile of his indebtedness to the Jew.

The passage of the weak and strong in chap. 14 is the chief evidence for the Gentile composition of the Church, and is discussed at length (pp. 39-59). The reference to Pythagorean asceticism is dismissed, though favoured by Spitta. Jewish influence is more probable, although the use of flesh and wine was not forbidden in O.T. law. The ascetic notions discussed are evidently later developments. A partial parallel is found in 1 Co 8-10, which is also discussed. 'The apostle's exhortation to the strong and weak, accordingly, is, that the two parties have in the Christian obligation common to both a strong motive to harmonious feeling, mutual tolerance, and common hope. Because both have been received by God's grace, the one—the weak or Jewish Christians, are like the other—the strong or Gentile Christians, with one mind to praise the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.'

On another point of exegesis the author will not carry all his readers with him. He argues that 'Gentiles' (2¹⁴) are Gentile Christians. Certainly Gentile Christians are Gentiles. The question must be decided by the context. Dr. Feine argues skilfully, and attaches importance to the point, asking that his interpretation may not be summarily dismissed. The gist of what he says is that the terms used are too strong to be true of unconverted heathen in any case, especially when the standard of judgment 'according to my gospel' (2¹⁶) is taken into account. Dr. Feine refers 'Gentiles which have no law' to Gentiles in their converted state, not in their previous unconverted state, inasmuch as Christians are not under law (6¹⁵ 10⁴). V.¹⁶ is understood in the highest sense. 'It is one thing when Paul admits a doing of good and a clearness of moral feeling in the sphere of heathenism to a certain degree and in a limited field, and another when he puts it so high that in the final judgment these heathen are justified by the Judge Christ Jesus according to the standard of the gospel.' The chief difficulty in the way of this exposition is the phrase, 'by nature.' In a very interesting passage the author adduces examples of the antithesis 'nature-law' from Plato, Aristotle, and the Stoics, the latter as represented by Cicero. The upshot seems to be that the antithesis passes into harmony, as the highest law is identical with right reason, and this,

again, is identical with nature in its original state. Grace restores nature to its first state. 'I will put my laws into their minds, and write them on their hearts.' The converted 'do by nature the things of the law.' The proof to the unbelieving Jews that salvation is not dependent on their legal conditions is certainly convincing. Referring to the terms as current in Greek thought, Dr. Feine says: 'Had Paul coined the term, he would scarcely have made *nature* the opposite of *law*, because for him it is the Spirit or the Christ in us who enables man to do the will of God. But he puts aside the specific Christian view and terminology in order to take the same position as his opponent. So he takes up the phrase in order to say: If Gentile Christians without having the law as the basis of their moral action do, in accordance with their nature, what belongs to the domain of the law, they who have not the law carry its requirements in themselves. But *nature* is not to be understood as acting by necessity, but as a condition given with human existence, or as capacity to which man may or may not give effect. Since then, on one hand, the *Law* is God-given, and, on the other, Paul (chaps. 1. 2) regards man as made for God, so that *Nature* in the present passage includes this religious distinction of man, the reason why the Gentiles do by nature the works of the law is that God's law and our own nature are in unison as springing from the same source. In Jesus, an essential doctrine is that humanity is to be restored to the state corresponding to the nature of man. Paul has the doctrine here.' We cannot question the ingenuity of the interpretation.

One of Spitta's many hypotheses is that the

body of the Epistle was originally drawn up, not for the Romans, but for the apostle himself, probably about the time of the Jerusalem council, in order to vindicate to his own satisfaction the rightness of his Gentile mission. Sending it to Rome with additions was an afterthought. This original draft he takes to be 1^{16b}–11¹⁰. Here Jewish Christians are addressed, elsewhere Gentile Christians. He also makes Paul's Gentile apostleship the result of the failure of his labour among Jewish hearers, altogether ignoring the statements to the effect that the Gentile mission dates from his conversion and first call.

Dr. Feine devotes a long chapter to the refutation of Spitta's theory that the Epistle is made up of two different Epistles to Rome, the second consisting of 12¹–15⁷ and 16¹–20. The reasons in favour of the proposal are drawn from the contents, especially the several greetings met with in the last chapter. The reply of Dr. Feine consists in a minute examination of these reasons. Although Dr. Feine disagrees with this theory, he goes so far in the same direction as to hold that 16¹–20 is really a brief note to Ephesus. Here, again, the reasons alleged are internal. The greetings, it is said, do not suit Rome, and they do suit Ephesus. 'The weakest point of the Ephesus hypothesis is to explain how this small writing, if it was not a Roman letter, came to be incorporated with this one, and why it was not put at the end, but towards the end of the Roman Epistle.' This is not the only difficulty.

As a ground-plan or map of the Epistle, Dr. Feine's study is eminently helpful and suggestive.

J. S. BANKS.

Leas.

'Born of Water and Spirit.'

BY THE REV. JOHN REID, M.A., DUNDEE.

THE interesting notes of Professor Lake's lecture, which were published in the April number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, direct attention again to the well-known difficulty of interpreting Jn 3⁵: 'Except a man be born of water and Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.' Professor Lake is right in saying that if 'water' were omitted the whole passage would be more homogeneous.

There would be little or no difficulty in the interpretation. It is the word 'water' which makes it a dark saying. The conclusion which he suggests is that the word was inserted on account of the importance given to baptism in the early Church—that it is in fact a tendency reading. If there were any reliable manuscript authority for this opinion it would be readily

accepted as a sufficient explanation. But 'conjecture' unsupported by manuscripts has not yet been accepted as an authoritative guide in determining the text of the New Testament. In the present case it is doubtful if Justin Martyr is referring to v.⁵ when he says, 'Except ye be born again, ye shall not enter the kingdom of heaven.' It is more likely that he is referring to v.⁸ The insertion of 'water' in v.⁸, which is found in the Old Latin and Old Syriac versions, in the Sinaitic Codex, and the quotation by Hilary, can be accounted for by its presence in v.⁵ We cannot argue that because 'water' is an insertion in v.⁸ it is therefore an insertion in v.⁵ The reading 'water' in v.⁸ is supported by a very few authorities, while in v.⁵ it is 'found in practically all the Greek MSS in existence.'

The wisdom of the rule that the more difficult reading is to be preferred to the more simple, has not yet been disproved. Before we yield to the temptations of ease and simplicity, it is well to ask if there is no other alternative. Is it not possible that by cutting out 'water' from Jn 3⁵ we may be losing an important truth. May there not be a personal element in the statement to Nicodemus which explains the reference to 'water' in v.⁵?

The words 'born of water and spirit' are admittedly an explanation of the statement which Nicodemus had not been able to understand, namely, 'Except a man be born from above (ἄνωθεν), he cannot see the kingdom of God.' As spoken to him the words 'born of water' cannot refer to Christian baptism. In the New Testament Christian baptism is not yet exalted to the position which such an interpretation would give to it. Besides, in an explanation, any prophetic intimation as to Christian baptism would have seriously increased the difficulty of Nicodemus. Such an interpretation is inadmissible. If the word refers to Christian baptism, there is nothing for it but to agree with Professor Lake (and Wendt) and cut it out as a tendency-reading inserted because of the importance given to baptism in the early Church. If 'water' is to be retained, as we think it ought to be, it must be interpreted as referring to something which was known to Nicodemus at the time when the words were spoken.

As a member of the Sanhedrin it is almost certain that he had already heard of 'water' and 'spirit' in connexion with the kingdom of God.

Priests and Levites had been sent from Jerusalem to ask John the Baptist 'who art thou?' and 'why baptizest thou?' Most likely they had been sent by the Sanhedrin. But even if they were not, the emphatic declaration of John, given as it was in different forms and at different times, must have been known to Nicodemus—'the kingdom of God is at hand;' 'I baptize with water unto repentance, but he that cometh after me . . . shall baptize you with the Holy Spirit.' This declaration is found in Matthew, Luke, and John. It evidently formed an essential part of the teaching of John, and would be frequently repeated. Anyone who was acquainted with the teaching of John would recognize that 'water and spirit' in relation to the kingdom of God was not a new phrase or a new idea. It is, in fact, inconceivable that Nicodemus was unacquainted with it. The wide stir which John's ministry created and the important place which Nicodemus held in the community are the grounds for that opinion. Further, we must never forget that the relation between Jesus and John was a public fact, and that the teaching of the one might be expected to agree with or be connected with the teaching of the other.

Our interpretation of the statement, 'Except a man be born of water and Spirit, he cannot see the kingdom of God,' is that in 'water' our Lord is referring to the work of His forerunner, and is intimating to *Nicodemus* the necessity of repentance for entrance into the kingdom of God. John had represented his baptism with water as inadequate, but not therefore as unnecessary. He had even indicated the kind of baptism which would supply whatever was inadequate in his—the baptism of the Spirit, to be given by Him who came after him. The importance of the relation between Jesus and John, especially at the beginning of the Lord's ministry, is too little thought of. We believe that our Lord is here linking the work of His forerunner with His own. He is repeating the testimony of John. He may have intended to recall the teaching of John to Nicodemus by referring to 'water' here. As a class the Pharisees (of whom Nicodemus was one) had rejected the teaching and baptism of John. They did not see or feel that they required to repent. That was a fact of spiritual significance which Jesus could not ignore when dealing with one of them. In the various records of His personal dealing with individuals we generally see

that there was one moral or spiritual experience in the life of the individual on which He lays hold. To the woman at the well of Sychar He says, 'Go, call thy husband.' To the rich young man who asked, 'What must I do to inherit eternal life?' He says, 'Sell what thou hast, and give to the poor, and come follow me.' Is it not possible that in the case of Nicodemus he is laying hold of the pregnant fact, in regard to which his own conscience had condemned him—the refusal to accept the teaching of John? Later in His ministry our Lord referred to this in dealing with the Pharisees—'The baptism of John, whence was it? from heaven or from men?' It is quite in the line of the Saviour's method that He should say something to Nicodemus, which had a peculiar and personal reference to him or to the class which he represented. The relation of the Pharisees to John, and the importance our Lord gave to it, make it almost certain that in dealing with a Pharisee He would refer to this crucial spiritual fact. If those are right who find that John is associated with Jesus in v.¹¹, 'We speak that we know, and testify that we have seen; and ye receive not our witness,' the certainty is absolute. He had that disbelief in mind. He was recalling to him a perhaps forgotten spiritual conflict and defeat. He was repeating the truth which he had refused, that *he*, Pharisee as he was, must repent if he would enter the kingdom of God. The self-righteousness and Pharisaic pride which had kept him from yielding to the call of John must be broken or discarded. He must humble himself to the position of a penitent. There was no way into the kingdom of God by which he could avoid this necessity.

This explains not only the presence of 'water' in the narrative, but it also explains its emphatic position. The incongruity of that position has been felt. In the Old Syriac Codex, published by Lewis, the order of the words is 'born of the Spirit and water.'

If this interpretation is correct, 'water' would have no difficulty for Nicodemus. It would awake again the voice of conscience. He would feel more and more that Jesus was a teacher sent from God, for no man could read the heart and know the hidden life as He did. The word only

forms a difficulty for us, because we have taken what was intended for the individual as if it were intended for all. We have read them as if they had no peculiar relation to the person to whom they were addressed, forgetting that it is said twice with emphasis, 'Verily, verily I say unto *thee*.' The particular form of the statement is due to the fact that it is addressed to a particular individual. The reference to repentance under the form of 'water' is out of place in a universal statement of the principle of entrance to the kingdom of God.

Repentance is a spiritual effect, and is not produced apart from the Spirit. There is no need to say, as a universal rule, that a man must first repent and be born of the Spirit before he can enter the kingdom. He cannot repent without the Spirit. But in dealing with a man who had rejected a great teacher preaching repentance, as it seems Nicodemus had done, it was necessary in pressing the truth on his conscience that he should be reminded of his disobedience, and urged to yield to that which he had refused.

By treating the word 'water' in this way we solve the difficulty which has hitherto attended its interpretation. Recognizing that it refers to Nicodemus alone, we can give effective weight to it as an element in our Lord's personal dealing with him. And having done so, we can lay it aside in stating the universal condition which must be complied with, and read it simply as, 'Except a man be born of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.'

There is, we believe, no other alternative, unless we follow the suggestion of Professor Lake, and drop 'water' altogether out of the passage. We would adopt his suggestion, in spite of all its difficulties, if we did not think the explanation given above is greatly to be preferred. The suggestion of Mr. James Neil, in his *Figurative Language in the Bible*, referred to in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, vol. iii. p. 97, that 'water and Spirit' are to be taken as an instance of *hendiadys* and interpreted as if our Lord had said, 'Except a man be born of spiritual water, he cannot enter the kingdom of God,' does not commend itself to us. For one thing it fails to comply with the first requirement of an explanation. It does not explain.

The Character of David.

BY PROFESSOR ROSS G. MURISON, M.A., B.D., UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, TORONTO.

IN the popular mind the prominent men of the Old Testament story are generally grouped in two great classes—the very good and the very bad. In the one case the evil, in the other the good traits or actions are neglected or explained away. For example, one seldom hears a good word spoken of Balaam and Saul, while David and Solomon are regarded as wonderful saints. Lot and Jacob are almost the only persons of importance in the Old Testament about whom tradition is not firmly decided.

The character of David is certainly much more complex than common repute would make it. Had it not been so, he could never have impressed his memory on the imagination, reverence, and love of his nation as he did. Taking the story in Samuel as our authority for the life of the great king, we see a strange mixture of good and evil, of royal virtues and human frailties. David was a great and a good king, for his character was strong in the qualities which make a king successful and great; while its weaknesses, though many and heinous, were not such as at that time and in that environment would greatly detract from his authority or his reputation.

His greatness and enduring fame certainly began with and rested upon the remarkable generalship which he manifested throughout his whole career. Personally very brave, often foolhardy, he inspired the entire confidence of all his followers. But a courageous and successful commander may have the confidence of his troops, and yet, because of the coldness of his manner be like the Iron Duke, a thing apart. It was quite different with David, in whose character the most outstanding trait was a magnetic power of winning the affection of those who came into close contact with him, and in keeping them devoted to his person. Saul 'loved him greatly,' until he saw where the ambition of his favourite pointed. Jonathan 'loved him as his own soul,' and continued to do so in spite of his knowledge of David's ultimate aim (1 S 20³¹). His devoted men braved great dangers to give him a little pleasure, for which he has casually expressed a desire (2 S 23^{15, 16}). Joab, his right-hand man, one who feared neither God nor man, loved

him with a fierce devotion which never wavered. 'All Israel and Judah loved David' (1 S 18¹⁶); and when he appeared among the people after the rebellion of Absalom was crushed 'he bowed the heart of all the men of Judah.' This 'lovableness' gives the key to much in the character of David, for it could have its origin only in a certain charm of manner in him, and in kindly sympathy and thoughtfulness. It is this trait in his character which has surrounded his memory with a halo of love and devotion, as well as of reverence.

David had the necessary qualifications of a great statesman, shrewdness, common sense, and a knowledge of human nature. The latter he gained in the eventful period of his youth. His statesmanship is seen in his conquest of Jerusalem, and its establishment as his capital; and, more clearly still, in his actions looking to the union of the two divisions of the people into one kingdom on a friendly basis. His execution of the assassins of Ishbosheth; his lament for Saul and Jonathan; his mourning for Abner; and his kindness to Mephibosheth were all measures to placate the Northern Hebrews, and incline them to accept David as king. These actions, as also his sparing of Saul, do manifest a kindly disposition, a magnanimous mind, and yet they were strokes of statesmanship, and were, one is inclined to think, meant to be so. His affectionate disposition is also manifested in his mourning for his infant son, and for Absalom. David had a very strong sense of justice; his decision that the spoil should be equally divided among those who were forced to stay behind is a clear proof of this, as is also his answer to Nathan's accusation. There are also glimpses of a humility very rare among Oriental princes (2 S 16^{11, 12}, 23¹⁷).

But there is a reverse to the shield. The innocent youth out on the hillside, herding his father's flocks, meditating on the wondrous works of God, and breathing forth his devotion in unexcelled verses, is but a beautiful imagination with no foundation in the Bible story.

After the rupture between the king and Samuel, the leader of the prophetic party, the prophet incited David, whose ability he discerned, to aspire

to the throne (1 S 16¹³). Saul, a shrewd man of affairs, soon discovered at least David's share in the plot, and the young man had to flee for his life to the recesses of the mountains, where his prowess soon placed him in command of a gang of freebooters, the scum of the country (1 S 22¹). David is not altogether to be blamed for this highwayman stage in his career; it was probably the only course open to him, and naturally all the outlaws would gather around a revolutionary leader of ability. Even in his lawlessness he evidently has some ideals, for he established a system of blackmail similar to that of Rob Roy, and for certain payments would insure farmers against pillage (1 S 25^{1ff.}).

In spite of the inherent kindliness of his character, David was utterly untrustworthy, unscrupulous, and cruel when it served his purpose to be so. To 'lie' oneself successfully out of difficulties has always been regarded in the East as the highest diplomacy. Samuel has no hesitation in circulating a false report about the cause of his visit to the house of Jesse, and David certainly availed himself of this 'liberty to lie' with great skill. He lies to his brothers in the camp; he furnishes Jonathan with a falsehood to tell Saul; he lies to the trusting priests of Nob, and is thus the cause of their massacre; he pretends madness at Gath, and on other occasions shows his 'trickiness.' The times may give some justification of these tricks, but it is much more difficult to excuse his cruelties. Because of the refusal of Nabal to pay blackmail, David intended to massacre all his household (1 S 25³⁴), and the tortures to which he put the Ammonites quite late in his career appear to us the very essence of cruelty (2 S 12³¹). Whatever 'apology' may be brought forward to defend the complete slaughter of conquered enemies, no excuse can be offered for David's massacre of the Geshurites, Girzites, and Amalekites (1 S 27^{7ff.}). This raid is worse than Turkish atrocities, for here there is not the palliation of religious differences and ancient enmities. David and his gang, for the sake of plunder, and that alone, fall upon unoffending peoples, and then slay them, men, women, and children, because 'dead men tell no tales.' David, for the time being, has been forced to take refuge with the Philistines, and naturally, he does not want them to hear of his gross breach of faith towards them in plundering their friends. To account for the spoils taken

in this raid he lies most bravely. The adventures of David during the freebooter period of his life show a daring resourcefulness, and at times also a grim humour. Had David not succeeded in becoming king, he would certainly have lived long in the traditions of the people as a hero of the Robin Hood or Rob Roy type.

The loveliness and affectionate nature of David were a source of weakness as well as of strength. The weakness is seen in his proneness to fall suddenly and often in love, and unfortunately with him, to love was synonymous with to lust. The marriage relationship was always held in high honour among the Hebrews, but it presented no restraints to David, although he always endeavoured, by fair means or foul, to prevent his *amours* causing him trouble. He falls in love with Abigail, seemingly an estimable woman, and very soon afterwards her husband dies suddenly and mysteriously, and Abigail is added to the harem of David. Even Jewish tradition cannot explain away his dastardly treatment of Uriah. In spite of the fact that this man, a foreigner, is away fighting the battles of Israel, the king sins against his honour. To hide his sin, David sends for Uriah, but that noble soldier will not enjoy the comforts of his house while his comrades are enduring hardships. The king plies him with strong drink, but drunk or sober, Uriah clings to his ideals of soldierly action. Baffled, David can only order what is practically a cowardly assassination.

It may be said that here we have an example of a good man falling through sudden temptation, but such a fall would be psychologically impossible had David been a man of high ideals for even his own time. That he was not is seen by the case of Abigail, and very clearly by Joab's estimate of the character of his king, when he sent word to him of the death of Uriah.

Was this, however, the turning-point in his life, and did the rebuke of Nathan bring him to repentance? We should like to believe that it was so; but the Bible story reveals few marks of true repentance. The king certainly did not remove Bathsheba, who was also guilty; but she remained to the end of his life the most dominant member of his harem, and exercised a great influence over him.

After the death of Uriah there is little recorded of David which reveals character. Lack of control over children is too common an Oriental failing to be brought against him. The numbering of the

people was a non-moral act. If wrong, it was at most an error in judgment. Orientals to this day cannot understand, and strenuously resent, the taking of a census. When the plague broke out it was in true Semitic manner connected with the detested numbering. Much more serious is his slaughter of the descendants of Saul (2 S 21). Saul realizing that David had a good chance of becoming king, and knowing the most common policy of a usurper, made David take an oath not to slay his children should he become king. In spite of his solemn oath he executed almost all of the descendants of Saul. It is true it is to stop the famine, and is at the instigation of an oracle, supposed to be Jehovah's, but one has an uneasy suspicion that David was pleased to have it so.

In this estimate no account has been taken of the story of the death of David. If his deathbed was as described there, it is one of the saddest deathbeds in history, and at once closes the question of his claim to be regarded as having been at any time of his life a good man. But while David was certainly not an ideal man, we can scarcely believe him to have been so treacherously ungrateful and vindictive as he is here represented to have been. This account was most likely composed in the time of Solomon to justify the policy of that king, who soon after his accession executed all whom he considered might be dangerous. The historian, finding the story among the other 'annals of the kings,' naturally regarded it as historical.

While reluctantly we are forced by a study of the Bible narrative to deny to David that exceptional sanctity with which tradition has clothed him, we must at the same time acknowledge the many estimable traits in his character, and see that as *king* he was a man after God's own heart. David was raised up of God to weld the people

together, to give them confidence in themselves, their power, and their future,—a confidence they have never lost,—and to set the nation upon its way as a suitable channel for God's revelation of Himself. The work of David was most important, and was absolutely necessary in the preparation of Israel for the part it was to play in the development of the world. David was not himself a spiritual leader, but his work prepared the way for the prophets, and was performed at a crucial period in the history of Israel.

It is sometimes asked, Had David sufficient spiritual insight to write any truly devotional Psalms. To this question some unhesitatingly answer, 'He had not. His cruelty and licentiousness prove that.' The environment in which he lived, with its moral standards, and also the peculiar constitution of the human mind, must, however, be taken into consideration. That David was a deeply religious man, and truly grateful to God is seen in his enthusiasm for the Ark. While religion was, as a rule, non-moral, and the standards of life low, yet may not David have written hymns which were true for the conditions then, and also true now when given an interpretation in accordance with Christian standards? Both Babylonian and Egyptian hymnology give examples of this to some extent. Again, although not a man of high ideals, may he not have had his moments of longing after better things? Burns certainly fell far short of the standards of an ordinary decent life in his day, and yet some of his poems strike a deeply spiritual note. Why may not the same be true of David? That some of the Psalms ascribed to the poet-king could neither have been penned by him, nor proceed from his time, is certain; yet there seems no good reason for denying to David the power to write true religious poetry.

At the Literary Table.

THE LITERATURE OF THEISM.

SELECTIONS FROM THE LITERATURE OF THEISM. Edited, with Introductory and Explanatory Notes, by Alfred Caldecott, M.A., D.D., and H. R. Mackintosh, M.A., D.Phil. (T. & T. Clark. 8vo, 7s. 6d. net.)

Who would ever have expected so beautiful and delightful a book with such an unpretending com-

monplace title? Who would have thought that Theism could have been made such a pleasant thing to think about, under any title? The Literature of Theism!—we are not theists, we say, we are Christians; and then, just when we are about to toss the book aside, there catch the eye Cousin's wonderful words about Beauty, and at once we are with Christ. Why did Cousin write so lovingly

of God as 'the principle of perfect Beauty'? Because he had heard Jesus say, 'Consider the lilies; Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these.'

Our eye may catch Dr. Caldecott's forefinger, as it were, pointing to some turning in the march of thought which we in our hurry or general reading should certainly have missed. We are arrested and read: 'The last five paragraphs must be carefully studied. They contain the proof from the idea to the Cause of the idea; and it will be found that Descartes is struggling to express a new and profound thought lying under an old and more superficial one. Superficially, the argument proceeds by using the principle of Causality in an external way, to construct a bridge from one thing (his idea) to another (a Perfect and Infinite Being as the Cause of that idea). It is his doctrine of representative perception that some ideas must have Causes. He then shows that the idea of perfection is one of these; then by the method of exclusion, which he frequently employs, he concludes that the Cause must be a Perfect and Infinite Being. But underneath this he sees a relation between the "idea" and the "Object" which is of a more intimate kind, viz. that one is involved in the other by immanent and inherent necessity, the finite in the infinite, and the infinite in the finite. In this deeper view he is coming into the vein of thought in which later Idealism was to do its work.'

Or again, we may be held by one of Dr. Mackintosh's swift emotional sentences, which suggest so much more than they say. But the thing that surprises us, after we take to the book and study it, is the mastery both editors have of their subject. Those are the passages which make Descartes, Spinoza, Martineau, Janet live; and those passages, interpreted as they are interpreted here, make the study of the doctrine of God, even on its philosophical side, alive and practical for all men.

Dr. Caldecott is responsible for Anselm, Aquinas, Descartes, Spinoza, the Cambridge Platonists, Berkeley, Cousin, Comte, and Janet. Dr. Mackintosh deals with Kant, Schleiermacher, Mansel, Lotze, Martineau, and Ritschl. The Index (as manifest a fruit of scholarship as any chapter in the book) gives one at once complete control of the subject, and a ready reliable means of tracing the progress of all the great theistic topics down through the history of thought. Take an example—

- FAITH, *precedes Reason, and follows it*, Anselm, 5.
 „ *in relation to Reason*, Aquinas, § 1.
 „ *in revelation beyond natural light*, Descartes, 44.
 „ *no separate Faith*, Spinoza and Martineau.
 „ *equivalent to Intuitive Reason*, John Smith.
 „ *disallowed*, Comte.
 „ *gives objectivity of knowledge*, Lotze, 368.
 „ *the only religious organ*, Mansel, 361.
 „ *the form of religious knowledge*, Ritschl, *passim*.

THE PATHWAY TO REALITY.

THE PATHWAY TO REALITY. The Gifford Lectures [in St. Andrews] for 1903-1904. By the Right Hon. R. B. Haldane, M.P., LL.D., K.C. (*Murray*. 8vo, 10s. 6d. net.)

In a new preface to this volume—a preface as frank as the book itself—Mr. Haldane touches on a criticism of his former volume (which contained the first series of his Gifford Lectures), and says, 'One critic has stated that the book was a mere reproduction in modern form of what had before been taught by Aristotle and Hegel.' That criticism is most unjust, because it is so true. It is so unjust that Mr. Haldane might have resented it keenly. He does not resent it; he simply admits the truth of it. The critic has expressed Mr. Haldane's purpose, has admitted in the very criticism that Mr. Haldane accomplished his purpose, and yet has made that the point and sting of his criticism. It is as if he had told Dr. Driver that in his new commentary he had merely expounded Genesis.

And yet this critic, so falsely right, is altogether wrong. Mr. Haldane has not merely reproduced what Aristotle and Hegel taught. He is Aristotle and Hegel and himself. He is the Greek, the German, and the Englishman. He is the heir of the last five and twenty years, of T. H. Green and F. H. Bradley, as well as of all the ages since Aristotle. That 'merely' is intended to carry the sting of the criticism. Mr. Haldane accepts it. But it is wholly false. It is the more unjust that Mr. Haldane saw how easy it would be to be glaringly original, and rejected the temptation.

The course of lectures is in two parts. The first six lectures deal with the nature of what is Divine, the last four with the nature of what is human. At the close of the first part Mr. Haldane reaches the doctrine of the Trinity. He sets it in the phraseology of Hegelianism, and shows its truth to Science as well as to Religion.

There are little touches which cannot be accepted. 'The doctrine of the Trinity is by no means a specially Christian doctrine. You find it in other religions.' That is not true. You find triads in other religions, and you may call them trinities, but they are radically distinct from the Christian doctrine of the Trinity. It is one of the great services which the Science of Comparative Religion will yet render us, the science which has suggested the identity, to show that the similarity is not identity. The doctrine of the Trinity is the gift of Jesus Christ.

And so, again, Mr. Haldane is wrong when he claims the Logos doctrine of St. John for the School of Alexandria, and says, 'it may well be that this sentence (Jn 1¹) is an interpretive sentence, which was inserted into the Gospel of John by somebody of a more metaphysical mind than its original writer.' The *word* used (Logos) is no peculiar possession of metaphysics; and that first sentence in St. John is sufficiently accounted for by the combination, Moses and Christ. Mr. Haldane says that 'the translation of this first sentence in John's Gospel is very difficult.' It is. But the difficulty is not solved by translating it in terms of Greek philosophy. Mr. Haldane's rendering is, 'In the beginning was the concrete actuality of Spirit, and this concrete actuality of Spirit stood in relation to God, and one aspect of God was the Spirit which was so related.' St. John was not so metaphysical as that. He was more Jewish and more Christian. The Logos took flesh, St. John's mind is set on that. 'He was one of us, and we beheld His glory.' His Logos is the Mercy-seat and the Manger.

THE TEACHING OF JESUS.—By the Rev. D. M. Ross, D.D. (*T. & T. Clark*. Crown 8vo, pp. 202. 2s.).—It is surprising that this subject has not already been taken up in the 'Handbooks' series. It is so popular. It is so easy. At least it seems so easy till we try it; and it *is* popular. It lends itself admirably to Bible-class treatment. One can take or reject, one can be imitative or original, one can write much, for there is no end to what might be written about the teaching of our Lord, or one can write little and make it very good. Dr. Ross has been working at it for a long long time, and he has been able to put much thought very clearly into short paragraphs. It is

an elaborate full book. The wonder is that it did not run to a great bulky volume. The greater wonder is that it did not get stifled for want of air. This is likely to be the subject now, and this the text-book, for the greater number of our Bible Classes in the coming winter.

THE CHRIST WITHIN. By T. Rhondda Williams (*Clarke & Co.* 1s. 6d.).—Mr. Inge has given us to understand the true heresy of the Abbé Loisy. It is the separation of the historical Jesus from the dogmatic Christ. Mr. Williams escapes the heresy by simply accepting the historical Jesus and making *Him* Lord of the life. Christ—the Christ John saw and heard and handled—in you, that is glory.

The Heavenly Feast is the title of a small—very small and dainty—'Companion to the Altar,' written by the Rev. Evan Daniel, M.A., vicar of Horsham, and published by Messrs. Wells Gardner, Darton, & Co. (9d. net).

Mr. Kelly has now published the first volume of that series of lectures which are being delivered in Manchester, and have been noticed more than once in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. The volume is entitled, *Is Christianity True?* (6d.). The authors included are—Mr. J. Lewis Paton, Dr. J. Hope Moulton, Archdeacon Wilson, Professor Peake, Canon Hicks, Dr. R. Waddy Moss, and Principal Adeney.

THE BEAUTY OF GOODNESS. By G. Beesley Austin (*Kelly*. Crown 8vo, pp. 208. 2s. 6d.).—Each little essay is introduced by a prose and a poetical quotation, a prayer, and a passage of Scripture. These are all so well chosen that the little essay has the charm of a fine (and very short) sermon, introduced by exquisite music and simple devotion.

THE EDUCATION OF THE HEART. By the Rev. W. L. Watkinson (*Kelly*. Crown 8vo, pp. 256. 3s. 6d.).—Is it possible to educate the heart? That it is needful we do not doubt. A narrow heart, it is so common. 'Meadows never spoke of his mother; paid her a small allowance with the regularity and affectionate grace of clock-work.' Mr. Watkinson believes it is possible. His school-books are Fellowship with God and

Service for man. Then he believes we might all, or almost all, possess hearts like Solomon's: 'And God gave Solomon . . . largeness of heart, even as the sand that is on the seashore.' The whole volume is illuminating, every sermon a lesson in life and godliness.

THE GOSPEL FOR TO-DAY. By A. E. Garvie, M.A., D.D. (*Inglis Ker.* 2s. net).—The gospel—yes, Professor Garvie knows and teaches it. The gospel for to-day—yes, he has understood how the modern mind may be reached, he has spared no pains to understand and reach it. 'We shall miss him,' they said, when he left the provincial town for London, 'we shall miss him, no one will come and speak to all our life as he did.' This is the strength of the pulpit, this is the most hopeful outlook for the gospel, that men who know life believe in the gospel as its transfiguration. It is no new or partial gospel; it is not the 'teaching of Jesus,' it is not the 'blessed human example'; it is, 'I, if I be lifted up.' Theology? Dr. Garvie's gospel is saturated with dogmatics; there is no gospel that does not carry with it the doctrine of Justification by Faith.

THE MIND OF ST. PETER, AND OTHER SERMONS. By Mandell Creighton, D.D., D.C.L., LL.D. (*Longmans.* 3s. 6d. net).—Are duty and faith apart? Are they far apart? If they are, what did our Lord mean when He said of the centurion, 'I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel'? The centurion had spoken of duty; he had done his duty; he expected others to do theirs; he knew of nothing beyond duty: 'I say to one, Go, and he goeth; I also am a man under authority.' And Jesus said, 'I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel.'

Dr. Creighton's last sermon in this thoughtful volume takes the centurion for its text. And there is nothing unseen sought for in the centurion's story. He did his duty; he expected others to do theirs; he expected Jesus to do His; he believed that Jesus was able in the way of duty to heal his servant, and that was greater faith than Jesus had yet found in Israel. We call the works of Jesus miracles; the centurion called Jesus the miracle, His works were the doing of His duty. That was his faith.

THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF

PRAYER. By the Right Rev. A. C. Hall, D.D. (*Longmans.* Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d.).—The Bishop of Vermont was appointed Bohlen Lecturer for 1904, and chose the Doctrine of Prayer. For he had learned to understand as well as practise prayer from 'Doctor Liddon and Father Benson and Mr. Jellett.' There are four lectures. The first is on the Christian Idea of Prayer, the second on Prayer according to God's Will, the third on Union in Prayer, and the fourth on Prayer in the Name of Christ. These are rather 'strategic points' in the doctrine of prayer than attempts at a treatise. And it is Dr. Hall's deliberate intention to meet the keenest difficulties felt in prayer, not to work out a dogmatic exposition of it. The directness and firmness of touch of every lecture are of more convincing value than the closest argument.

VISITATION CHARGES. By William Stubbs, D.D. Edited by E. E. Holmes (*Longmans.* 8vo, 7s. 6d. net).—Dr. Stubbs, both when he was Bishop of Chester (there is one Chester Charge here) and when he was Bishop of Oxford, forgot when he went on Visitation that he was a great historian. He dealt exclusively with the things of the moment. Accordingly this volume of Visitation Charges is as useful to the student of ecclesiastical life as a bundle of State papers would be to the student of political life. What were the things that occupied the minds of bishops and clergy in the end of the century? They were Socialism, Higher Criticism, Mixed Chalice, Ablutions, Eastward Position, Lights, the Sign of the Cross, and Disestablishment. Dr. Stubbs had a great mind, and on all these things he pronounced a weighty judgment. Were they not worth it? We do not seem able in this life to reserve our judgments for things that are worthy. It may seem incongruous to hear Dr. Stubbs say that he 'turns to the congregation and holds the patten in his left hand, whilst he breaks the bread with his right hand, and then shows the cup in his hand to the people before he lays his hand upon it.' But Dr. Stubbs is not the author of the incongruity.

THE NEW TESTAMENT IN THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH. By E. Caldwell Moore (*Macmillan.* 6s. 6d. net).—'With what authority doest Thou these things, and who gave

'Thee this authority?' So the Pharisees asked the Lord. To-day we put the question to the New Testament. The authority of the New Testament is assailed as hotly as ever Christ's was. It must vindicate itself. With what authority does it rule our religious life, and who gave it this authority?

That is the question which Professor Caldwell Moore answers. It is, of course, a question to be answered from history, and history is often hard to interpret. It is nowhere harder than here, and there is the added difficulty of keen feeling and vital interest. Professor Moore has a good grasp of his subject and of himself. We believe that there is no other book in English which will so readily and so fairly answer just the question, Who gave the New Testament its authority?

METHODS AND AIMS IN ARCHÆOLOGY. By W. M. Flinders Petrie, Hon.D.C.L., LL.D., Lit.D. (*Macmillan*. Crown 8vo, 6s. net).—This is a *vade-mecum* for all those who go down to Egypt in our day. They go to dig. This is the book that tells them how to dig and find. It is a great art. Who could have fancied that it required so much of the wisdom of the serpent? Did we not all think it was the harmless dove that went down into Egypt to dig? No, no; you must be very wise and wideawake. If you have not your camera and do not know how to use it, stay at home, for the camera has much to do in archæology. But still more needful are the keen eye and the deft hand. It is a charming, clever book Professor Flinders Petrie has written, and it is most cleverly and artistically illustrated. He pays for his discoveries—pays in brains and will and heart.

THE RELIGION OF AN EDUCATED MAN. By F. G. Peabody (*Macmillan*. Crown 8vo, 4s. 6d. net).—It is a sound principle that the rich should be sent to evangelize the rich, the poor as missionaries to the poor. Professor Peabody goes as an educated man to win the men of education for Christ. He is excellently well equipped. He can speak the language, he has insight, he is both tolerant and firm. And it does seem as if this were the day upon which the reproach that not many wise had been called should be rolled away. Our educated men have discovered that there are things in heaven and earth which education cannot give them. We even think that Professor Peabody

could demand more than he demands, perhaps than he thinks it worth demanding. For our part we should like to send a missionary after him to carry his work up to the fulness of the grace and truth. But to get educated men to 'look unto Jesus' as He was, though not as He is—even that is great gain.

SERVICE AND INSPIRATION. By Alexander Smellie, M.A. (*Melrose*. 2s. net).—What is the reason for the order of words in the title? There is a reason. Mr. Smellie attends to all the details. It is a volume of sermons, as strong in thought and self-expression as it is delicate in expression. The texts have to be studied; the sermons leave us studying them. For the sermons are suggestions, hints at Scripture meaning, thoughts for life, impulses toward self-sacrifice, they are never expository and dogmatic commentaries on the texts.

THE ESCHATOLOGY OF JESUS. By Lewis A. Muirhead, B.D. (*Melrose*. 6s.).—It must not be said that Mr. Muirhead's theme is a difficult one as if that were an excuse for failure. Mr. Muirhead's book needs no apology. It is no failure. Difficult as the subject is, Mr. Muirhead has handled it with great modesty, yet with perfect lucidity and occasional manifest mastery. His discussion of some matters of considerable moment, such as Christ's use of the title, 'Son of man,' is so learned and discreet that it will command the attention of the best scholarship. By this volume the Bruce Lectureship has at once taken its place beside the great Bampton, Cunninghams, and the rest.

Mr. Melrose has published a new *In Memoriam*. The daring is great. But there is no question of the intention. Not that the author or Mr. Melrose mean to challenge comparison; the comparison is too frank and open for that. The new *In Memoriam* is altogether itself just because in form and sentiment it is so closely shaped upon the old. An imitator would easily have concealed the imitation. Its title is *Amor Immortalis* (2s. 6d. net.).

For once to all men comes the gift
Of prophecy; their sight is clear;
And if their preaching be sincere,
They need not try to gauge its drift.

So the gift of song has come to this man, once

at least, and he does not care to gauge its drift. He has no creed. And so he is always theological, creedal. The aspect which life presents first is always the broad creative and redemptive aspect—

We sat outside the convent wall
And mused upon the life within,
So far from trouble, far from sin
And sorrow, and so far from all

That makes life, as it seems to me,
Worth living, since the primal ban
Was laid upon poor fallen man
Which only left him sympathy.

There is one matter in which as art it advances beyond the first *In Memoriam*. There is a sense of 'something coming.' It is never so thrust upon us as to make us skip or hurry, it is there to make us quiet—

We caught the spirit of the year,
And laughed and revelled in the sense
Of our young blood's omnipotence,
And knew not what was meant by fear.

We never paused that we might see
The cryptic writing on the wall,
The rich fruit ripening to its fall,
The river leaping to the sea;

We only knew that life was good;
We only knew that life was ours;
It was not till the sunset hours
We paused to think—and understood.

FIRST STEPS IN HEBREW GRAMMAR. By Michael Adler, B.A. (*Nutt.* 2s.).—Whether for private study or for class work we are free to recommend Adler's *First Steps*. His method is the motto of Demosthenes: Practise, practise, practise.

The Religious Tract Society has fallen into the prevailing habit, and published a sixpenny edition of *Present-Day Papers* by the late Principal Cairns, under the title of *Christ and the Christian Faith*.

ROADS TO CHRIST. Edited by the Rev. C. S. Isaacson, M.A. (*R.T.S.* Crown 8vo, pp. xii, 282. 3s. 6d.).—Mr. Isaacson wrote *Roads to Rome*; this is better; this is more congenial. This is written by the Bishop of Durham, Prebendary Webb Peploe, and others, as well as Mr. Isaacson himself. Each man tells his own story, tells by what road *he* came to Christ. Or else Mr. Isaacson tells it for him, for half the book is brief

biography. It is all intensely earnest, intensely evangelical. There is no other Name, and the time is short.

THE SLAVE IN HISTORY. By William Stevens (*R.T.S.* Crown 8vo, pp. 379. 6s.).—It is very becoming for the R.T.S. to publish a popular history of the slave trade. We do not now divorce religion from morality. This is the very best 'evidence for the gospel.' Indeed, the history of the slave trade reveals the secret things which Christianity holds better than any other history or any other fact. Who could have supposed, when Christianity began, that the time would come when it would be felt intolerable to buy and sell and make merchandise of men? What is the next great moral revolution which the spirit of Christ will work? Mr. Stevens proceeds mostly by biography. He is popular and picturesque always.

SCENES AND SAYINGS IN THE LIFE OF CHRIST. By James H. Snowden, D.D. (*Revell.* 8vo, pp. 371. 5s net).—The writers of notes on the Sunday School lessons do not always take their work seriously enough. They under-rate the education of the average teacher and the intelligence of the average boy. Their Notes are the wearisome commonplaces of old-fashioned commentaries. What we like Dr. Snowden's Notes for is that he reads the life of Christ for himself, and reads it carefully enough to find a continual surprise in it. He moves, and we move with him, through a land that is always Spring. The freshness, the surprises, are in the life itself, not in Dr. Snowden's way of describing it. He is no American showman to Christ.

There are many aids to the study of the Bible, but they are mostly outside. Mrs. Horace Porter takes us inside. *A Lamp unto My Feet* reveals the state of heart and will necessary (Stock; 1s. net).

THE BIBLE AND THE PRAYER-BOOK (*Stock.* 1s. net).—This is a searching and yet sympathetic comparison of the Prayer-Book with the Bible. It is published anonymously. The manner of it will be seen in the following. After quoting all the passages from Scripture usually quoted on behalf of the doctrine of Apostolical

Succession, 'there is surely,' says the writer, 'no basis in any of these Scriptures upon which to build up the tremendous doctrine of Apostolical Succession; indeed, we can find no foundation for it in the New Testament. In his *Christian Ecclesia* (p. 216) Dr. Hort tells us that "Jewish usage, in the case of rabbis and their disciples, renders it highly probable that *laying on of hands* was largely practised in the ecclesia of the apostolic age as a rite introductory to ecclesiastical office; but as the New Testament tells us no more than has been already mentioned, *it can hardly be likely that any essential principle was held to be involved in it.*" In *The Conception of Priesthood* (p. 57), Dr. Sanday of Oxford says: "The act did not denote the transmission of a power or energy from one who had it to one who had it not." That is true both to Scripture and to common sense; but it is not in harmony with the doctrine of Apostolical Succession, nor of that of the priesthood as taught by the Prayer-Book.'

We may catch the point of Mr. Patterson Du Bois' *The Point of Contact in Teaching* (Sunday School Union; 2s. 6d.) most readily if we quote what he begins to say about 'Missing the Point.' He says—

'I remember once hearing an address to children based upon the text, "The little foxes that spoil

the vines." These little foxes were our small vices or weaknesses. Why did the speaker choose such a point of departure? I suppose "the little foxes" had a simple, childlike sound about it to him, and seemed as though it would be easily a point of interest to little children. Perhaps it was, in so far as it roused their curiosity. Whatever the children got out of the address, they got in spite of, rather than because of, the point of departure, which was not a point of contact with common experience. To very few children does a fox exist in more than name, if that; and the propensity of foxes for spoiling vines is one which they could not appreciate unless they had lived in a country where they had actually seen this kind of destruction wrought, or heard it talked about until it became a familiar fact.

'In the same way, writers for children often seem to suppose that they are placing themselves on the child's plane by the use of certain kinds of youthful expressions, and by a kind of forced intimacy of manner, while the situation, the motives, and raw material out of which the story or article is made are foreign to the child's perception, thought, or feeling.'

Messrs. Watts have issued Renan's *Life of Jesus* in their unbound sixpenny series—misspelling his name every time it occurs.

Contributions and Comments.

Precedent Cases and 'Fazanias' in Bible History.

THERE is a form of early literature which perhaps has not yet been sufficiently considered in interpreting certain features of the O.T. and N.T. This is the study of precedent cases in early law codes and elsewhere. I have met with them chiefly in early Spanish law codes, where they are termed *hazanias* or *fazanias*.¹ They are found, I

presume, in many other ancient and mediæval codes, but I confine myself to those which I have at hand.

The peculiarity of this literature is the great difference of the form, and of the immense practical importance of the matter contained under the form. The *fazanias* were, in some cases at least, composed and intended for the use of provincial and local judges, to be learned by heart by those who could neither read nor write. In them were laid down the main principles of law, the rules by which the judge should be guided in his decisions. It was therefore of the utmost consequence for the welfare of the people that the matter should be right, that the legal maxims laid down in them should be just and correct. But as to the form in which these legal maxims were embodied we find

¹ The word, written in various ways *hazaña*, *façaña*, *fazania*, would mean in general literature, 'heroic actions,' 'great deeds'; it is derived from the Latin *facere*, and in this sense is like *gestes*, *gesta*, from *gerere* in Mediæval French. For its legal sense compare our legal term, 'deed,' 'deeds,' 'act,' etc.

the most astonishing latitude. Some of the *fazanias* are fables, some are folk-lore tales, some parables, some satirical stories, some pseudo-cases invented for a particular purpose, gradually they become limited to real precedents, to cases which have actually occurred, and have been decided in the highest law courts, generally by the king himself; and in this sense they are finally incorporated into the law codes and disappear. Thus in the *Leyes del Estilo*, a compilation of the end of the thirteenth and beginning of the fourteenth centuries, we find, Ley 198: 'Of the *fazanias* of Castille, how they ought to be held as law' (*por fuero*). After this incorporation or assimilation, I have not observed any further mention of them.

There are not wanting examples of strictly precedent cases in the O.T. The most marked instance is that of the inheritance of the daughters of Zelophehad (Nu 27¹⁻¹¹ 36¹⁻¹², Jos 17³⁻⁵). This is almost paralleled by the *Fazania del Fuero de Castilla*, Lib. i. Tit. v. Ley 5, except that the case is there one of brothers and not of sisters. Other cases in the O.T. would be Nu 15³²⁻³⁶, Lv 24¹⁰⁻²³, 1 S 30²³⁻²⁵.

But it is not to these more or less regular legal precedents, which are founded on some actual fact, or on tradition received as fact, that I wish to draw attention, but rather to the freer forms which the *fazanias* take in the provincial and local law codes. Seven *fazanias* are attached to the *Fuero de Navarra*. They were evidently intended to be learned by heart by judges who could not read nor understand the more precise and technical language of the law. They are—

1. How a man should correct those under him, and do no wrong.
2. How a Christian should defend himself in a suit with a Jew.
3. How a Jew should defend himself in a suit with a Christian.
4. How a woman condemned to be stoned to death was defended, like Susanna, by the help of some young men.
5. How a judge sold judgment in a suit between a merchant and a peasant.
6. Of a judge who for two oxen sold his judgment when he had received something from the other party.
7. Of a man and a serpent, and how no one ought to be sentenced when under constraint (*i.e.* so that he cannot defend himself?).

Now of these seven precedents or rules of justice, No. 1 insists not only on the right, but on the duty of a man to chastise those under his charge, wards, pages, apprentices, men - servants: 'because it would be better for the son of a well-born man to be dead than to be brought up badly; for from bad bringing up follow many evils, and no good.' Cases like 2 and 3 are found in most of the local *fueros* between Jews and Moors and Christians of the time. Nos. 4 and 7 are manifestly folk-lore tales, and could never have been meant as cases of actual fact; the lesson to be learnt from the story is the only thing of importance. It is curious to observe how like the plea of the serpent is to that of Bertrand de Gourdon to the dying Richard 1., 'What have you done to me!' replied the prisoner; 'you killed with your own hands my father and my two brothers, and you intended to have hanged me.' The serpent replied to the man, 'Yes, you killed my father and my mother, my brothers and sisters, and all my relatives, and I ought to kill you.' But the judge and the man let the serpent go, and then killed him. Nos. 5 and 6 are satirical tales; the one, to show the guilt of the judge who takes bribes, the other, the folly of him who offers them, as he may be outbid by the other party. At the end of the seventh we read: 'This *fazania* refers to justices, landowners, and mayors,' the three classes who would administer justice in Navarre.

I would now suggest that there are frequent instances of this kind of teaching in the O.T. and N.T. The parable of Nathan to David (2 S 12¹⁻⁶) is clearly of this character, so also are many of our Lord's parables. The fictitious character of the form does not in the least detract from the importance and the value of the matter enshrined in it; nay, sometimes even enhances it, and makes it more impressive. The vehicle matters little. A king's ransom may be conveyed in a wheelbarrow, or in a common cart: 'we have this treasure in earthen vessels' (2 Co 4⁷). Especially we may expect to find teaching of this kind in matters on which man has not, nor can have, any clear or proper knowledge—matters in which all mankind are somewhat in the position of rustic judges bidden to carry out and execute laws, the technical meaning and wording of which they can neither read nor understand, but the true import of which it is imperative, both for their own conduct and for that of those under them, that they should be thoroughly well acquainted with. Mankind is in

somewhat such a position with regard to many truths taught and enunciated in Scripture. The form is comparatively of little, certainly of no historical, value; but the lesson conveyed is true and of supreme importance. For instance, a little reflexion will show us that it is perfectly impossible that any contemporary historical account of the Creation, or of primitive man, could ever have existed; but in Gn 1-3 we have, as it were, the *fazanias* to teach us the moral and religious lessons of it, and its bearings on our conduct. The form may be scientifically untrue, but the lesson most true. And with this account of the world's earliest history, we may compare the scene of the last act of its great drama given us in Mt 25³¹⁻⁴⁶. Try to picture this as actually, literally, historically true. Is it not utterly impossible under any conditions known or imaginable to man? Yet the lesson is plain and true, it is none the less imperative, it does not lose its importance because of the medium in which it is conveyed, nay, this makes the lesson only the more impressive and universal, binding upon all because all can comprehend it. We can turn to it with all the confidence with which the rustic unlettered judge would turn to his *fazanias* or precedent cases, knowing well that if he followed them he would judge and act aright, even if he knew that they were not historically true.

The reader must judge how far such a principle applies to other narratives and parts of the O.T. and N.T., and how the unhistorical character of a writing, the form in which it is cast (e.g. the Song of Solomon) detracts nothing from the value and importance of the matter conveyed in it. The instance of the *fazanias* shows that this has been the case in the most important affairs of civil life.

WENTWORTH WEBSTER.

Basses Pyrénées.

2 Sam. xviii. 23: דָּרָה הַפֶּלַי

MAY not these words refer rather to the manner of Ahimaaz' running than to the route which he took? From v.²⁷ we learn that his style was distinctive and well known. Our ignorance as to the exact locality makes it impossible to do more than guess why Ahimaaz should have had an advantage by choosing 'the way of the plain,' and, if so, why the Cushite did not choose the same route. Might the suggestion be hazarded that דָּרָה הַפֶּלַי should

be rendered 'in the manner of the racecourse (circle or ring),' signifying that Ahimaaz was a trained and practised runner, and so 'passed by' the Cushite? The absence of other references to the foot-race in the Old Testament, while telling against this interpretation of the words, would give them fresh interest if the proposed rendering were accepted.

J. E. M'OUAT.

Logiealmond, Perth.

The Unjust Steward.

I.

IN the two articles occurring in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for April, both the Rev. George Murray and the Rev. W. D. Miller seem to accept the usual view that the steward was guilty of fraud. May I refer them to a discussion of the parable in *Pastor Parorum* (pp. 386-398), by the Rev. H. Latham, M.A. There it is pointed out that the phrase rendered 'unrighteous' (τῆς ἀδικίας) in the Revised Version has primarily a wider meaning, and might stand for any kind of offence, criminal or not; that it sometimes means little more than 'bad' in the sense of ineffective or unsatisfactory. The story does not suggest to us that the steward had practised fraud: the accusation is simply one of waste, and the steward is not represented as being in fear of punishment for crime, but in fear that he will lose his situation. He has nothing to fall back upon, he has made no capital out of his master; to live in future he will have either to work as a labourer or beg. Looking at the steward in this light, we may gather that his fault lay in having made bad speculations with his master's property, and in having had dealings with men not financially sound. Under these circumstances he acts most astutely. He saves the debtors from utter bankruptcy and perhaps imprisonment by compounding with them; thus he makes them his friends, and at the same time, by retrieving as far as possible his master's loss, gains his approbation also. Though he has speculated rashly in the past, now he acts with the astuteness of a capable business man.

The point of the parable for ourselves seems to lie in the words, 'The sons of this world are for their own generation wiser than the sons of light' (Lk 16⁸ R.V.), and our Lord would have His

followers use the same astuteness in regard to religion as a good man of business uses in regard to the temporal affairs of life. The parable is meant to teach what we may call sanctified common sense. Let the Christian man use this in his endeavours to win men as friends both to himself and to Christ, and then, when through death the use of the worldly mammon passes from him, he may expect to be reunited to those friends in the eternal mansions of God.

HAROLD FIRTH.

Bradford Parish Church.

II.

In the April issue of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES both Mr. Murray and Mr. Miller, the former explicitly and the latter by implication, recognize that the whole burden of the difficulty of interpretation lies in the second portion of v.⁹ in the story (Lk 16). All the rest is perfectly plain, and the moral, Be as wide awake about religion as worldly men are about their own interests, follows quite legitimately. 'The sons of this world are for their own generation wiser than the sons of light.' The further moral, Make to yourselves friends out of the mammon of unrighteousness, is also sufficiently clear if taken alone. But when our Lord adds 'that, when it shall fail, they may receive you into the eternal tabernacles,' the whole complexion of the teaching is altered at once. Calvin had a glimpse of this, and wrote that the parable had for its main drift that we 'must show kindness and lenity in dealing with others.' Latham, in his *Pastor Pastorum*, faces quite candidly what Calvin allowed himself only to hint, and says plainly, in an interesting passage, too long to quote here, that our Lord, looking forward to a time when His power would be delegated to the apostles as stewards, was exhorting them not to insist too inflexibly upon every point of honour or privilege for the church; was teaching them that they might do good by a little indulgence, by conceding something to weak human nature; and was encouraging them to expect that the people who thus got to heaven through their lenient treatment, would welcome them to the eternal tabernacles. It was characteristic of Latham to interpret the passage as it stands. No other interpretation is possible without violence to the words. If this interpretation leads to a conclusion that is bizarre, and to morals

that are Machiavellian,—if the policy advocated is a questionable policy to gain a questionable end,—that was not Latham's affair; he had to take the teaching as he found it. Mr. Murray's method is different. He says 'it was some one's later thought to read "everlasting habitations," in the allegorizing spirit, as the somewhat mechanical interpretation of the phrase about the steward's reception by the debtors into their houses.' But who is this anonymous 'some one' and what have we to do with his later thought? As the passage stands, it appears plainly to be our Lord's thought that is here expressed; and, if it is to be regarded as having any weight at all, it quite neutralizes Mr. Murray's airy exposition. about resolution and resource. Mr. Miller has a different way of cutting the knot. He ignores the crucial passage altogether and proceeds with his exposition just as if the passage did not occur. By this method he arrives at teaching which is rather ingenious and may be wholesome, but is certainly not obvious in the parable as it stands. The only legitimate exposition of the passage is, as Latham saw, the Machiavellian. That is, if the passage is to be read as we have it in our texts. The question then remains whether it should be so read. Is it not a little strange that neither Mr. Murray nor Mr. Miller makes reference to the suggestion of Dr. Jannaris, in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES of two years ago (vol. xiii. 128), on this very matter? Dr. Jannaris simply suggests the insertion of a mark of interrogation after *δέξονται ὑμᾶς* in the crucial passage. Thus our Lord's meaning would be, 'Shall I also say unto you, Make to yourselves friends, etc.? No. I say unto you the very opposite. In the everlasting tabernacles he that is faithful in the least thing is faithful also in a great deal,' etc. Is there any objection to this? The punctuation of the text is of course a matter for the editors; and must be done *ad sensum*,—there is no other way. With the punctuation of Dr. Jannaris we get, without any distortion or ignoring of the words, a sense which is entirely in harmony with the general teaching of our Lord.

HENRY T. HOOPER.

Bournemouth.

Scotch Editions of the Septuagint.

IN my article on the Septuagint I mentioned (*D.B.* iv. 440 note §) from Græsse's *Trésor des*

livres, an edition *Glasgow*, 1822 18^o, and supposed that it was identical with No. 19 of my list (*Glasguae*: 1831 = *Londoni*: Tegg, 1843, two very small volumes, 667, 703 pp.). I have since come into possession of these editions, and see that I was mistaken. Though all have almost the same title, yet the former is a different impression, in three volumes, containing the Apocrypha, which is missing in the other.

1. 'H ΠΑΛΑΙΑ ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ ΚΑΤΑ ΤΟΥΣ Ἑβδομήκοντα. VETUS TESTAMENTUM, ex versione Septuaginta Interpretum. Juxta exemplar vaticanum, ex editione Holmesii et Lamberti Bos, Tom. i. (ii. iii.), *Glasguae*: Ex Prelo Academico; Impensis . . . Rivingtons & Cochran . . . *Londini*; Bell & Bradfute, et A. Black, *Edinburgi*, 1822 [12^o].

The first volume has 548 pp.; the second is missing in my copy; the third has 554 pp., and is interesting, because *Εσδρας α* begins on the same page (272) on which *Malachi* ends. At the end 'Andreas et Joannes M. Duncan, *Academia* [thus in the third volume, for *Academiae*] *Glasguensis Typographi*.'

2. (a) The edition of 1831 consists of two volumes only, as stated above, and has on the title after Lamberti Bos: cum præfatione parænetica Joannis Pearson, D.D., Editio nova. *Glasguae*: typis et cura Hutchison et Brookman; Impensis Thomæ Tegg, *Londini*; et Ric. Griffin et Soc., *Glasguae*, 1831.

At the head of the first volume, before *Joannis Pearsonii Præfatio Parænetica*, stands *Typographorum Præfatio* (xii pages), dated *Glasguae*, *ipsis Kal. Jan.* 1831.

(b) The edition of 1843 is identical with that 1831, but has a new title-page: *Londini*: Impensis Thomæ Tegg; R. Griffin et Soc., *Glasguae*; Tegg et Soc., *Eblanæ*; necnon, J. et S. A. Tegg, oppid. Sydney et Hobart; and at the end, instead of '*Glasguae*: excuderunt Hutchison et Brookman,' the remark, '*London*: Balne Brothers, Printers, Gracechurch Street.'

3. The edition '*London 1837*' (No. 18 in Swete's Introduction from *Urtext*, 67) seems due to the misprint of the catalogue of a second-hand bookseller, and is almost certainly identical with that of 1831, while Swete's No. 16 must be quoted with the years 1831, 1843, instead of 1827, 1831.

In the Bible Catalogue of the British Museum,

only the first edition of 1822 is mentioned, not those of 1831 and 1843. EB. NESTLE.

Maulbronn.

'Let the Woman learn in Silence.'

MRS. GIBSON'S notes on the above passage are very interesting and suggestive, but is she quite correct about the force of *ἴνα* in Eph 5³³? Has she not overlooked the force of ἡ δὲ γυνή before the *ἴνα*? I see Dean Robertson, in his new commentary, argues for an ellipse before *ἴνα*, as in 1 Co 7²⁹.

Then Mrs. Gibson also says 'ὑπακούετε "obey" is never used in regard to wives.' I suppose she means 'wives of the New Testament,' for 1 P 3⁶ has Σάββα ὑπήκουσεν τῷ Ἀβραάμ in a context which counsels 'submission' to Christian wives (1 P 3^{1, 5}).

W. H. GRIFFITH THOMAS.

London.

Note on John xix. 11: 'The Greater Sin.'

THE difficulty of this passage comes from the assumption that when Jesus says that Pilate's power was given him from above, He is referring to the divine decrees. This is not so. Our Lord's thought here is not that which is expanded by Peter in Ac 2²³ 'Him being delivered by the determinate counsel,' etc., but rather that of Paul in Ro 13¹ 'There is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God.' It was this that made the sin of Caiaphas in delivering Jesus over to Pilate 'the greater': that is, not 'greater than Pilate's sin,' but 'greater than the sin otherwise would have been.' There is no form of injustice so heinous as that which seeks to utilize for its own ends the divinely authorized institutions of human government. It has been commonly supposed that Jesus was here making a kind of apology for Pilate. But Pilate was at the moment on the brink of a moral collapse, and the hint of such an apology could only have hastened his ruin. On the contrary, Jesus is reminding Pilate of his tremendous responsibility. 'Thou hast power, but it is a divinely entrusted power, and therefore there must be the more care in using it. Take warning from Caiaphas. Just because your power

is divine, his sin in seeking to make it his tool is the greater. For the same reason, your sin too will be the greater, if you fail in doing justice.'

JOHN PORTEOUS.

Paisley.

The Carob and the Elephant.

I AM very glad to hear from Dr. Cheyne that some one else has also hit upon what appeared to me to be the most probable solution of the locust question. It affords a mutual corroboration.

Mr. Farmer's contribution is a good practical illustration; and I shall be glad to quote it in a forthcoming work on *Biblical Plants*, in which there are some fresh identifications and previously unnoticed plants.

I incidentally referred to Behemoth as the elephant, as there were several items mentioned which seemed to be better referable to it than to the hippopotamus. Perhaps readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES might like to have two references to it. Ezra the Prophet (4 Ezr. Vis. iii. 6. 49), after enumerating the works of the creation as recorded in the first part of Gn 1, alludes to two creatures, 'The name of one thou calledst Beemoth, and the name of the second thou calledst Leviathan. Thou separatedst one from the other . . . Thou gavest to Beemoth dry land where there are a thousand mountains. But to Leviathan thou gavest one of seven wet parts,' etc. This seems to mean that the first was the elephant and the other the hippopotamus.

The other work to which I will refer, is O. Celsius' *Hierobotanicon* (1748). He is describing *Pincus* under ארר, and refers to the passage: 'He moveth his tail (זנב) like a cedar' (Job 40¹⁷). Celsius says that most Rabbinic writers regard זנב as the tail: 'Junius vero, Coccejus et Schmidius de membro genitali exponunt; Quod valde absonum videtur, sive hippopotamum velis esse, sive elephantum. Neque usus vocabuli זנב apud Orientales populos, quantum sciam, illam significationem admittit.' Others have thought, he says, that the word referred to the trunk, as the word would refer to any extremity, and quaintly adds: 'Equidem vidimus elephantum, a ductore suo institutum, tot mira facere porrecta ac varie inflexa proboscide, ut hac eum ludere et delectari, quod est in Jobo, verè dixisses. Verum ad nos non pertinet tantas componere lites.'

There are two printers' errors in my note, 'Did Jonathan taste Hachish?' *Cannabis judica* should have been *C. indica*, and for 'swifter' (col. 2, l. 7) should be read 'simpler.'

GEORGE HENSLOW.

London.

Raka.

THE contribution on 'Raka' in your February number discussed a question which has interested the undersigned for many years. When I was a small boy, if I may be pardoned a personal allusion, the solemn words: 'Whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be in danger of hell fire' (A.V.) frightened me terribly. I dared not use the word 'fool' as my small playmates did. But I thought I could cheat the divine vengeance and at the same time indulge in a boy's love of epithets if I employed the term 'idiot'—a bit of legalistic casuistry which may be considered a *reductio ad absurdum* of many analogous interpretations of the Sermon on the Mount. But shall we, when we have put away childish things, be free to regard these words with less concern?

The meaning of the passage does not lie on the surface as the many interpretations to which it has been subjected, show. Mr. Smith is right, I think, in referring the *krisis* to the local provincial court, and the 'Sanhedrin,' of course, to the supreme court of the Jewish nation. In that case there is evidently a progress intended in the degrees of punishment from the *krisis* to the 'Sanhedrin,' and finally to the 'Gehenna of fire.' This would imply a corresponding progress in the forms of the sin mentioned—the angry thought, the use of *raka*, the use of *moré*. Whether *raka* was simply an interjection expressive of contempt, as St. Augustine is quoted as holding, or whether it is the equivalent of *kenos*, as St. Jerome holds, may be a question. To the present writer the latter view seems more probable. In that case *raka* would express contempt more especially for the intellectual endowment of the one who is insulted. *Moré* is then best explained by the Hebrew idea of 'folly,' in which a moral and religious element is involved.¹ To call a man *moré* would then imply a much more

¹ Cf. Ps 14¹ and Is 32⁶ for the use of נָקִי. At Is 32⁶ the R.V. singularly enough translates נָקִי and נָקִיָּה by 'vile' and 'villany.'

serious imputation than to call him *raka*, though many of us nowadays seem more willing to be called irreligious than 'empty-headed.' But in whatever way *morè* may be related to *raka*, is it a so much more vicious term of reproach that its use must be punished by 'hell fire,' while the punishment by the 'Sanhedrin' is sufficient for the use of *raka*? There seems to be a gulf fixed between the punishments for the use of *raka* and *morè* as difficult to bridge over as another celebrated gulf. Many have sought to deny that there is any gulf. (a) Thus, starting from the idea that Mt 5^{22a} cannot be taken strictly, since unexpressed thoughts are not the proper subjects for the judicial action of an earthly tribunal, it has been held that *krisis* and 'Sanhedrin' must both refer to the heavenly tribunal. They are thus brought into harmony with the 'hell fire,' which is also an 'eschatological' punishment. This interpretation has found favour with some Roman Catholics, who discover in the allusion to various forms of penalty in the future life a justification of their doctrine of purgatory.¹ But it seems quite arbitrary to take the *krisis* of v.^{22a} of a heavenly tribunal when the *krisis* of v.^{21b} undoubtedly refers to an earthly tribunal. (b) Mr. Smith has adopted just the opposite expedient. Rightly taking *krisis* and 'Sanhedrin' as implying forms of earthly punishment, he interprets 'Gehenna of fire' in the same way. It is not the 'hell fire' of the A.V., but the accursed 'Valley of Hinnom.' Thus again the violent change from an earthly to an eschatological punishment is avoided. The fatal objection to this method is that 'Gehenna of fire' is never found in the New Testament except in its eschatological significance. The term is employed in v.³⁰ of this very chapter with an undoubtedly eschatological meaning. (c) Still other commentators, perplexed by the difficulty of the transition, have denied that there was any progress intended either in the description of the sin or of the punishments. The different forms of punishments do not, it is said, correspond to different degrees of sin, but to the same sin described in various ways. But this is to daub over and blur the brilliant Oriental colouring of the passage. (d) It remains for Keil, that prince of sophistical harmonists, to suggest that, since the human tribunal is, according to Dt 1¹⁷, 2 Ch 19⁶, but the representative of the Divine, therefore the first two punishments are in the same category with the last (!) These contradictory expedients illustrate how impossible it is satisfactorily to close up the gulf referred to between the first two punishments and the last. The gulf still yawns.

¹ Cf. Tholuck, *Die Bergpredigt*, p. 195.

But if we cannot close up the gulf, may we not at least bridge it over? The suggestion of B. Weiss still appears to be the most satisfactory: From v.^{22a} it has already been made clear that the judgment of the *krisis*, and consequently of the 'Sanhedrin,' must be taken figuratively. Our Lord, in the Sermon on the Mount, which was designed to overthrow the reign of the 'letter,' certainly was not laying down a new code for criminal procedure. He simply desires to *illustrate* what He regards as the enormity of the sin of anger by the statement that it deserves the worst forms of punishment known to His hearers. He begins where the Pharisees leave off. They said murder was worthy of death, *i.e.* the severest punishment inflicted by the local provincial court. Jesus says, 'I regard the first germ of anger, the secret, unexpressed thought, as worthy of death.' He does not make the thought necessarily as bad as the deed. But He makes it as bad as the Pharisees made the deed. The first expression of anger, the contemptuous *raka*, is worthy of the most dreadful form of punishment known to the Jewish law, the death by the 'Sanhedrin,' which included excommunication. Jesus has now exhausted His earthly illustrations. For the third and more violent expression of anger, the malicious aspersion of our neighbour's character, He must resort to the punishments beyond the power of man to inflict, in order to impress upon His hearers the heinousness of the sin. Hence He refers to that solemn penalty which is in the hands of Him alone who has the authority to cast into Gehenna. As the first two punishments are simply *figures* of the worst punishments which it is in the power of man to inflict, so the last punishment is a *figure* of a punishment more terrible than any in the power of man to inflict. Not the immensely greater heinousness of the use of *morè* is responsible for this leap into the mysterious retributions of the other world, *but the necessities of rhetoric* and the figurative mode of presenting the truth which Jesus has adopted.

Have we then escaped 'hell fire' by resolving it in the present instance into a figure of speech? Can I look back upon my childish terror of using the word 'fool' as being as unreasonable as my childish fear of the dark?

We may have our various views of what this last punishment consists in, but the explanation suggested does not mitigate in the slightest degree the solemn lesson of the passage—the exceeding sinfulness of sin. An unuttered angry thought as bad as man accounts murder! A spoken word of insult as bad as man accounts a soul in torment! Our friends who cultivate 'the religion of healthy mindedness' and who exclaim after their sound night's sleep and fresh morning bath, 'God is

afraid of me,'¹ may regard our present passage as a mere Oriental hyperbole, but the believer in Christianity as a religion of Redemption will ponder more deeply, because of these searching words, upon the solemn mystery of human life.

KEMPER FULLERTON.

Lane Theological Seminary, Cincinnati, Ohio.

¹James, *Varieties of Religious Experience*, p. 87, note.

Entre Nous.

SERMONS do not sell. When they sell a little, preachers buy them. Why is it? Do congregations take the sermon in the hope that it may do them good, but take no more of it than is necessary? Or is there some difference between the printed sermon and the sermon that is heard, some difference that makes the one intolerable, though the other may be faintly relished.

No. These explanations are nothing. Sermons are enjoyed. They are enjoyed as much when printed as when preached. They are enjoyed when they are good. The disadvantage of the printed sermon is that so many poor sermons are printed, and it costs too much to discover whether printed sermons are good enough. When we have been disappointed a few times we are slow to buy even a volume by Inge or Rashdall.

A volume of sermons by Mr. W. R. Inge, Fellow of Hertford College, Oxford, has just been published by Messrs. T. & T. Clark. It will be followed by a volume by Dr. Hastings Rashdall, Fellow of New College. These volumes are carefully chosen. They are chosen because their authors are scholars as well as preachers. They are chosen and published in the belief that no one will be disappointed in the reading of them. They are chosen, not for the eloquence of their words, but for the suggestiveness of their thought. They are chosen because they are saturated with the most promising ideas of the present day.

Mr. Inge and Dr. Rashdall are the authors. When *Contentio Veritatis* was published, Professor Sanday chose the essays of those two men for notice. The rest of the men were scholars and their essays were good. But Dr. Rashdall's essay provoked Dr. Sanday to a searching criticism, and of the two essays by Mr. Inge he said, 'I wish that I could do justice to Mr. Inge's two essays, if only as some return for the genuine pleasure they have given me. To read them is like reading

poetry of fine quality. The thought not only moves in high regions, but it is also constantly touched by generous emotion.'

The (Scottish) Summer School of Theology is to be held this year in Edinburgh. If Aberdeen was so successful, how successful should Edinburgh be? The date is 14th to 18th June, and the place the New College, better known in England than even the New College of London, for the London New College has not produced a Davidson yet.

The lectures will be delivered in the forenoon and evening of each day, and will be open to all who pay the enrolment fee of ten shillings. The forenoon lecturers are: Professor Findlay of Leeds, Professors Iverach and Curtis of Aberdeen, Professor Orr of Glasgow, Professor Dill of Belfast, and Professor Skinner of Cambridge. In the evening may be heard Professors Paterson and Crum Brown of the University of Edinburgh, Professor Reid of Glasgow, and Dr. John Watson of Liverpool. A reception will be held in the New College on the evening of Monday, 13th June, by Sir John and Lady Clark. The secretary of the school is the Rev. Hugh Miller, Shandon, Dumfriesshire.

A month later than the Edinburgh Summer School a 'Vacation Term for Biblical Study' will be found at Oxford. It will last for three weeks, from 25th July to 13th August. The lecturers for the first week are Dr. Buchanan Gray, the Dean of St. Patrick's, Dr. Grenfell, Professor Margoliouth, Dr. Charles, Miss Wordsworth, and Sir Oliver Lodge. The lecturers for the other weeks are as eminent and interesting. The subjects range from the beginnings of the Old Testament right through to the beginnings of Christianity. The whole course is most attractive. The arrangements for the reception of ladies who wish to be present at the

lectures are in the hands of Miss Creighton, Hampton Court Palace, London.

When Professor Sayce tells us what the archæologists are doing all over the world, we read him with much pleasure. When he makes his own 'splendid guesses,' suggesting that the Hammurabi of the Monuments is the Amraphel of the Bible, or the like, we enjoy him even more. The guesses may not all turn out to be true; in some cases he may afterwards wish his Bathybius *were* at the bottom of the sea; but it is by good guesses that progress is made, and we are content to take the misses with the hits. But when Professor Sayce gets on his 'Higher Criticism' horse we are no longer lost in admiration.

Most of us will be content whether the archæologist or the critic wins. We wish to get the truth. Of late we have seen the archæologist violently attacking, the critic earnestly defending, the uniqueness of the Old Testament revelation. Professor Sayce did not enter that fray. Was he satisfied at last that the Bible had as much to fear as to hope from archæology, as much to hope as to fear from criticism? His answer has just come. He has published a new volume in the R.T.S. 'By-paths of Bible Knowledge,' calling it *Monumental Facts and Higher Critical Fancies*. He ignores the controversy raised by Delitzsch. He attacks the Higher Criticism in his old slashing manner. He uses once again the old familiar weapons.

Who was the unlucky critic who said that writing was not used for literary purposes in the time of Moses? Somebody must have said so, for Professor Sayce has recalled and ridiculed the saying many times. Here he goes a step farther, however. He makes that saying one of the two 'main supports' of the Higher Criticism. And who said that a legal code was impossible before the period of the kings? That is the other 'main support.' Well, if the criticism of the Old Testament really rested on these two sayings, it did not require the giant arms of a Sayce to pull the house down. But does Professor Sayce actually believe that the discovery of the Code of Hammurabi 'has for ever shattered the critical theory which would put the Prophets before the Law'? Any of us can see that that is absurd. Surely Professor Sayce has not been reading much in the Prophets or the Law of late.

Professor Sayce has made one hit. He has discovered one critic, and a notable critic too, who once denied the historical character of the fourteenth chapter of Genesis. Unfortunately, in the joy of discovery, he has lost all the advantage of it. For he has thrust upon Nöldeke notions which he not only never held, but has expressly repudiated. We need not increase the offence by repeating it. Professor Sayce is not the man to persist in a misrepresentation. But as to the fact. Is it a surprising thing that as long ago as 1869 one solitary critic should have been led to doubt or deny the historical accuracy of this chapter? And is it a useful method of controversy to speak of his mistake (if it was a mistake) as if it had been made by all the critics? Professor Sayce's friend and fellow archæologist, Friedrich Delitzsch, has denied all originality to the religion of the Bible, even to the length of asserting that the Babylonians were monotheists before the Israelites. Has any one said that all the archæologists hold that opinion?

Last of all, and worst of all, it is far from certain that even in this matter Professor Sayce is right. On the fourteenth chapter of Genesis Archæology is a house divided against itself. Professor Sayce knows very well that his identifications of the names Amraphel, Chedorlaomer, and the rest, are scoffed at by distinguished archæologists even in this country. If the names go, what is left? In any case, Nöldeke's arguments never touched Archæology, and Archæology has never touched them.

Just as we go to press there reaches us for review the book we have looked for so long, the greatest of all the books of Professor A. B. Davidson. The *Prophecy* might have been greater than it is, the *Theology* could not be greater. Principal Salmond has done his work on it in a way that entitles him to the gratitude of every lover of Professor Davidson, of every lover of the Old Testament. All this is evident in the reading of an hour. The review of the book must wait.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, St. Cyrus, Montrose.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE *American Journal of Theology* for April contains an article entitled 'A New Theory as to the Use of the Divine Names in the Pentateuch.' It is not a hopeful title. We have had theories enough. What we want now is a little fact. But the writer's name—'Henry A. Redpath, Oxford University,' in severe simplicity—makes us stop and read.

For the Rev. Henry A. Redpath, D.Litt., M.A., is the editor of the great Oxford Concordance to the Septuagint, and has been Grinfield Lecturer on the Septuagint in the University of Oxford since 1901. The compiler of a Concordance is not to be dismissed as a theorist. We are surprised to find that he harbours any theories at all. If he avows the possession of a theory, we may be sure that he will bring it face to face with facts.

It is a theory as to the use of the divine names in the Pentateuch. The prevailing theory at present is that the different divine names imply different sources. And then arises a most complex and forbidding array of algebraical-looking symbols. Dr. Redpath takes the latest and most scholarly book as witness—Dr. Buchanan Gray's *Numbers*, in the 'International Critical Commentary.' Dr. Gray discovers that the documentary sources of the Book of Numbers are (in alphabetical order) D, E, H, J, JE, P; and P is

subdivided into P^g, P^s, and P^x. There are eight in all. Dr. Redpath is astonished. 'Can anything more complicated be imagined?'

Dr. Redpath has no fault to find with Professor Gray's *Numbers*. 'It is a book full of most important matter, and, in particular, his illustrations from other religions are extremely valuable.' His quarrel is with the 'Critical' composition of the Pentateuch. He thinks it is too complicated and insecure. Now, it rests on the use of the divine names Yahweh and Elohim. If another account could be given of the use of these names, he believes that a fresh point of departure might be made in the study of the Pentateuch. His theory furnishes the fresh point of departure.

Look at Psalms 14 and 53 together. It is the same Psalm. There are differences certainly. The most striking difference is in the use of the divine names. In Psalm 14 Elohim occurs three times, and Yahweh four times. In Psalm 53 Elohim occurs seven times and Yahweh not at all. How would that be explained in the case of, say, a modern collection of hymns? It would be said at once that Psalms 14 and 53 were two versions of one and the same Psalm. Dr. Redpath knows of nothing to hinder us from saying the same of those two Psalms in this very ancient collection of hymns. And so his theory is that before the

Psalter assumed its present form, there existed two different editions of the Psalms; and so with the Pentateuch, and perhaps much else. The variation in the divine names is due to the fact that the collection from which Psalm 14 was taken was intended perhaps for the priests. They would take care not to pronounce the sacred name Yahweh when they saw it, and so the name occurs in their collection freely, though not exclusively. But Psalm 53 was taken from a popular collection, out of which the incommunicable name had been carefully removed, because the people could not be trusted not to utter it.

There is no case in the Pentateuch so clear as this case in the Psalter. But if there were two editions of the Psalter, or any part of it, it is probable that there were two editions of the Pentateuch, or at least of some parts of it. And if there were, then some curious things which occur in the Pentateuch itself can be very simply explained.

For instance. In the account in Gn 19 of the destruction of the Cities of the Plain, the name of Yahweh is used throughout. In the last verse of the chapter, however, there suddenly intrudes the name of Elohim. What is the explanation? The documentary hypothesis answers, A new document by a new writer. Dr. Redpath thinks his explanation is more natural than that. We all know how parts of manuscripts, especially the ends of them, get eaten away by time or fire or worm or water. What could be simpler than that the compiler of the present text used the manuscript of one edition till he came to a corner which was illegible, and then turned to the other? The edition from which he took the most of the story was the learned one; the end of it he took from the popular edition, from which the name of Yahweh had been carefully removed.

In the next chapter (Gn 20) it is all the other way. Now Elohim is used throughout, and Yahweh comes in at the very end. Driver says

19²⁹ belongs to P and 20¹⁸ appears to be due to the compiler of JE. Dr. Redpath holds that the same compiler compiled it all, but in the one case he used the edition of the learned, in the other the edition of the people.

It must be supposed, though Dr. Redpath does not seem to mention it, that the *new* text was not intended for the people. But Dr. Redpath does not think that its compiler was utterly indifferent whether he used Yahweh or Elohim. In the first chapter of Genesis the creation is ascribed to Elohim. This goes on to the middle of the fourth verse of the second chapter. At that point the compound name of Yahweh-Elohim begins to be used. Dr. Redpath understands that the compiler (or somebody) deliberately added the Elohim now, in order to show that Elohim, the God of Nature, who created the world, was identical with Yahweh, the God of Revelation and of Israel.

Who produced these two editions, and when were they produced? Dr. Redpath does not know. He thinks that the Yahwistic was the earlier, but he will not say more. Nor does he know when the new compilation was made which fused the two editions together and gave us our present text.

But Dr. Redpath believes that there is a passage in the Book of Nehemiah which preserves the occasion upon which it was first authoritatively declared that the name of Yahweh was not to be pronounced by priest or people any more. In Neh 8⁸ it is said that 'they read in the book in the law of God distinctly.' Now the adverb 'distinctly' represents a verb in Hebrew, and this verb occurs only twice outside this passage in all the Bible (though it occurs once also in the Aramaic, Ezra 4¹⁸), its occurrence in Ezk 34² being a misreading. One of the two occurrences is Lev 24¹², the passage about blaspheming the Name, the other is a passage of similar import in Numbers (15³⁴). Dr. Redpath understands that what Ezra did was to read the Law and *not* pronounce the

name Yahweh, and that from that time such reading was *authoritative*.

In Professor A. B. Davidson's *Theology of the Old Testament*, now happily published under the editorship of Principal Salmond, and reviewed on another page, one is sometimes arrested by a question without an answer. These unanswered questions do not occur often, for Professor Davidson was no mere examiner, and he had no delight in puzzling. But when they occur, they leave one thinking.

The section on the Redemptive Righteousness in Deutero-Isaiah has some questions in it. It ends with this one, 'Why are "a righteous God" and "a Saviour" identical expressions?' There is no answer. The section ends. The next section is, 'General considerations on the Eschatology of the Old Testament.' We are left thinking.

It is not 'Are they identical?' He has told us enough of the second Isaiah, he has sufficiently separated the second Isaiah from the first, and indeed from all who went before or who followed after him, to let us see that with him a righteous God and a Saviour *are* identical. Why are they identical? That is what he asks.

We are left thinking. We try the answer of experience. That was Isaiah's way of answering it, of getting at the very idea. He had found that God had redeemed Israel in sending them into captivity. At the moment of the captivity they all thought that He had cast them off. And they were compelled to acknowledge that for their sins He had done it. His righteousness had brought the Chaldean to the gates of Jerusalem. But the end of the Captivity has now come. Isaiah sees that the captivity has been the salvation of Israel. God had led them into a strange land that He might lead them captive to His own mind and purposes. In His righteousness He had been their Saviour. The words are identical, because experience has proved them so. Isaiah saw that.

But even Isaiah saw more than that. He saw that God is Himself. He saw that He is Himself always. He saw that God cannot be separated into parts. You cannot say, This is His righteousness, that is His mercy. Nor can you say He is righteous to-day, and will by no means spare the guilty; to-morrow He may be gracious and pass the transgression by. Even Isaiah saw that God is one and cannot deny Himself. He is righteous because He is a Saviour; He is a Saviour because He is righteous.

But Isaiah passed away before the final answer came. It came in the Cross of Christ. Why are a righteous God and a Saviour identical expressions? Listen. 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?' That is God's righteousness in its great display; it is also the great display of the Saviour. Both are seen in God as Father; both are seen in God as Son. And both are seen in Both at one and the same moment. But why? The question is, Why? The final answer is, Because God is love.

Mr. F. C. Burkitt has written a notable article to the *Journal of Theological Studies* for April. Its uncommittal title, 'The Early Church and the Synoptic Gospels,' might be chosen by any student who had got up enough to pass an examination and must at once write an article for a theological magazine. But it has distinction. It has that atmosphere of fulness, of saturation in the study of the Gospels, which only a scholar here and there carries with him. And it makes progress. We read those fifteen pages and feel that things which we held must go, and things which were floating have now become fixed.

We owe the Gospels to the early Church. And Mr. Burkitt's desire is to discover what fitness the Early Church had for giving us Gospels. Now, in the first place, there is not very much importance to be attached to the question, Who wrote the several Gospels? For it is evident to Mr. Burkitt that the Gospels express no single man's

convictions or memories. They are *memorabilia of the Church*. 'The Gospel record,' he says, 'had passed through a full generation of pious reflexion and meditation before it began to be written down and so fixed for all time.' Even the Second Gospel is not St. Mark's own nor wholly St. Peter's recollection. It is a record of how the things of Christ came to be told in Jerusalem among the disciples twenty or thirty years after the events took place.

The question then is not, How was St. Mark fitted for his task? At least the more important question is, How were the early disciples equipped for it? And this at once raises a definite issue. Were the early Christians capable of giving us Gospels? Mr. Burkitt shows with convincing clearness that at any rate they were not capable of inventing them. For they had no interest in history. They had no interest in biography. Their interests were in theology and in edification.

Mr. Burkitt takes Justin Martyr as an example. He might have taken St. Paul. For neither St. Paul nor Justin has any interest in the details of the life of Jesus upon earth. They quote His ethical sayings a little. They are almost wholly absorbed with the few events that have a theological significance. They describe and explain the Incarnation, the Crucifixion, the Resurrection, the Ascension. They do not once mention Capernaum; the house in Bethany has no warm associations for them.

The early Christians could not have invented the Gospels. And it is not a question of literary skill. The dispute about St. Peter's knowledge of Greek is not in it. Of immeasurably more consequence than literary skill is human interest. They could not have invented the Gospels, because the things which make up nine-tenths of the Gospels have not sufficient worth in their eyes to be once mentioned in the course of many writings.

If, then, the early disciples could not have invented the Gospels, what qualifications had they

for writing them? Their main qualification was what Mr. Burkitt calls *ethical sensitiveness*. They were not careful to criticise, but they were careful to be true. They had not the modern scientific sense, but they had the mind of the Spirit. There may be details in the Gospel narrative which were never described as they actually historically occurred. There may be details which got altered somewhat in the process of oral transmission. But from first to last, from the first telling by him who saw, to the last telling by him who wrote down, there was an ethical sensitiveness present in the Christian community. They would countenance nothing which departed from the truth as it was in Jesus.

Mr. Burkitt dramatically introduces one striking example. A gospel had been written which for the purposes of the early disciples, the purposes of edification, was of less value than St. Matthew or St. Luke. It did not contain the narratives of the supernatural birth and infancy; it was, to say the least, meagre on the narrative of the resurrection. So it was neglected. It was so greatly neglected, that at last only a single mutilated copy of it was in existence. Yet the early Christians preserved that Gospel. They admitted it into the Canon. Says Mr. Burkitt: 'The fine instinct—may we not call it *inspiration*?—which prompted the inclusion of the Gospel according to St. Mark among the books of the New Testament, showed the Catholic Church to have been wiser than her own writers, wiser than the heretics, wiser finally than most biblical critics from St. Augustine to Ferdinand Christian Baur.'

What was it that led the early Church to give us the Gospels? Mr. Burkitt calls it *ethical sensitiveness*. But now it appears that ethical sensitiveness is a name—a modern scientific name—for the very thing which we used to know by the name of *inspiration*.

'Commentators,' says Professor Davidson (to refer once more to his *Theology of the Old Testa-*

ment) 'complain that nobody reads Ezekiel now.' He is not sure that 'now' is the word, for there is no evidence that St. Paul read him. At least he nowhere quotes him. And yet there is a passage in Ezekiel which anticipates all the great doctrines of grace that are found in St. Paul, and even gives them in their proper order.

What is the passage, and what are the doctrines of grace? The passage is 36¹⁷⁻³⁸, beginning 'I will sprinkle clean water upon you,' and the doctrines of grace are these: (1) Forgiveness—'I will sprinkle clean water upon you'; (2) Regeneration—'A new heart and spirit'; (3) The spirit of God as the ruling power in the new life—'I will put my spirit within you'; (4) The issue of this new principle of life, the keeping of the requirements of God's law—'That the righteousness of the law may be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit' (Ro 8⁴); (5) The effect of living 'under grace' in softening the human heart and leading to obedience—'Ye shall remember your evil ways, and loathe yourselves.'

'The difficulties which surround the doctrine of divine immanence have been largely increased by that unscriptural, unphilosophical, and unscientific distinction between natural and supernatural, which I hope will receive its *coup de grâce* from the theology of the twentieth century.'

The sentence deserves to stand alone. Who has written it? The worth of it lies in that. If it had been written by one of our ordinary heretics, it would be worth nothing. We should know that all the meaning it contained was that there is no supernatural, that miracles do not occur and never did. But it is written by Mr. W. R. Inge.

The sentence is found in a sermon in Mr Inge's new volume, *Faith and Knowledge*. Mr Inge's sermons are not meant for our congregations, but for us. He can preach to the peasant, but he preaches best to preachers. It is the preacher that has to

give this distinction between natural and supernatural its *coup de grâce*. When we have made up our minds, the people will acquiesce.

The sentence occurs in a sermon on 'The Inspiration of the Individual.' For Mr. Inge is interested, as we are, not in the miracles that took place in Galilee in the first century, but in the miracles that take place in his own life and ours to-day. What hath God wrought? No. What is God working? That question must be answered first. If it has no answer; if, as Carlyle once complained, 'God does nothing,' then the miracles of Galilee cease to have interest or value. What sign showest thou that the Spirit of God is alive and energetic within thee?

And what Mr. Inge urges is that the only true signs are natural signs. In the world around us, the lower aspect of reality, that of which science takes cognisance, is in one sense coextensive with the higher, of which it is the symbol. It does not fully express the higher; it is limited by the very conditions of phenomenal existence. So is it in our own lives. 'God does not begin where we leave off. We need not swoon into an ecstasy to allow Him to work upon us. We need not "annihilate our will" or reduce our minds to a blank vacancy, that He may take the place of our will and thoughts. We need not sit with our arms folded to hearken what He will say to us. All such quietistic methods are pure delusion, and so is the expectation of any stormy irruption of a mysterious force into our consciousness. Such experiences are not suprarational, but pathological. I doubt whether a healthy mind ever has them. Even the sudden conversions, which in some Protestant sects the young are taught to expect, occur with suspicious regularity about the age of puberty, when the nervous system in both sexes is often temporarily disturbed.'

Is there then no such thing as personal inspiration? There is. But it is normal, natural, intelligible. Abnormal, violent, or mysterious

experiences of the soul may waken a new life or bring to the surface hidden strata of the subconscious life; but generally, says Mr Inge, generally it is by the still small voice that God speaks to us, not by the earthquake or the fire. And the cry, 'O to be nothing,' is a mistake. It is when we are most ourselves that we are nearest to God. For God is always the God of the living, not of the dead.

A curious illustration of Mr. Inge's belief that the time has come when the distinction between the natural and the supernatural should be abolished is offered in one of the Manchester lectures on the question, 'Is Christianity True?' It is curious, because it is so modern and because it is so scientific. The author of the lecture is Mr. Arthur T. Wilkinson, B.A., B.Sc., M.D., of the Manchester Infirmary. The title is, 'The Witness of Physical Science to the Triune God' (Kelly).

The doctrine of the triune God. It is the last of all the doctrines that we believe. It is the doctrine of all doctrines which men of science lose their patience with. 'Some men of science,' says Mr. Wilkinson, 'look askance at theology as if the man who enters her domain must leave reason behind, shut his eyes, and be prepared to swallow both gnat and camel.' Not equally in all parts of theology, however. In that part which deals with the Trinity most of all. Three in One and One in Three—it is neither arithmetic nor common sense. And yet Mr. Wilkinson has revealed a witness to the triune God in physical science.

In physical science he finds this witness, in the sciences of physics and chemistry. For, to speak theologically, the three great gods of physical science are Ether, Matter, and Energy, and these three are One.

There is Ether first. And no man hath seen Ether at any time, it is Matter that reveals it. At first it seems as though Ether were not one

but many, so various are its properties and so seeming contradictory, just as at the beginning man imagined from the variety and the seeming contradictoriness of God's ways that there were gods many. But now Ether is known to be one. And it is apparently omnipresent and unchanging in its being. Yet we say no man hath seen Ether at any time. It is faith, the faith of the man of science, that makes it ours. But the revelation has been made through Matter, the second person in this strange Trinity.

The second person in the Trinity of the man of science is Matter. The second article of his creed is, 'I believe in Matter.' And he does believe in it. Says Mr. Wilkinson: 'If the corresponding creed of Christianity were as firmly grasped by Christians, it would transform the Church of to-day.' We can see Matter. We can say of it as the disciples said of the Son of God, 'That which we have seen with our eyes and handled.' Nevertheless the same question is asked about Matter as was asked about the Son of God, 'What then is this?' Men used to say Matter is made up of atoms, and thought they had answered the question. Is not this the carpenter's son? But now Professor Larmor experiments on atoms, and suggests that the atom may be a miniature star cluster! It is true that there are men of science who deny the existence of Matter. The only physical reality they say is Ether, just as those old Pharisees said, 'Give God the praise—as for this man we know not from whence he is.' But the very highest authorities among modern physicists have come to the conclusion that Matter is derived from Ether. Years ago Lord Kelvin—we knew him then as Sir William Thomson—suggested that the atoms of chemistry were vortex rings of ether,—ether that had taken form and begun, so to speak, to dwell among us. And a modification of this theory holds the ground to-day. One thing at any rate is true of Matter, it has a universal power of attraction. And the Second Person in the Christian Trinity has this power also: 'I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto me.'

The third person in the Trinity of science is Energy. Now there is no movement in theology that is more promising to-day than the movement, hinted at by Mr. Inge, which gathers all the forces in the spiritual life of man into one place and calls them by the name of Holy Ghost. And there is no more assured result of modern science than the gathering together of the varied forces of nature—light, heat, sound, electricity, magnetism, molar motion, and so forth—and calling them by the name of Energy. What, said our scientific forefathers, can the blinding lightning and the gentle warmth of the home fireside have in common? What community, said our theological forefathers, can there be between the peace which passeth understanding and the passage of the soul in deep agony through the waters? It is the one Energy; it is the one Holy Spirit. To-day we pass through the deep waters, to-morrow we abide under the shadow of the Almighty; just as every mode of motion in the physical world may be turned in a moment

into any other. And more than that. The third person of the physical Trinity may be denied or quenched, as we know the Third Person of the blessed Trinity may be. Shut your eyes and the landscape before you is no longer flooded with light; deafen your ear and the song of the bird is but 'a few tardy waves of movement passing through the air.' Yet the song is not made by the ear, nor the landscape by the eye. And while men deny the existence of the Holy Spirit of God, He is knocking at the door,—the Light of the World,—and if any man will open the door He will come in and sup with him.

Ether, Matter, Energy—these are the three of the physicist's Trinity, and these three are one. Haeckel's creed is Monism; the Christian's creed is Monotheism. Ether, Matter, Energy—yes, yes, says Haeckel impatiently, but I believe in only one Nature. 'Hear, O Israel,' repeats the Christian reverently, 'the Lord our God is one Lord.'

Professor A. B. Davidson's 'Theology of the Old Testament.'¹

BY THE REV. J. A. SELBIE, D.D., MARYCULTER.

It was well known that for a good many years before his death Professor Davidson had been preparing a volume on *The Theology of the Old Testament* for Messrs. T. & T. Clark's 'International Theological Library.' After his death it became known that he had left the work practically complete, although not ready for publication. Its appearance has been awaited with eagerness by all students of the Old Testament, an eagerness which, in view of recent experiences, was mingled in some minds with misgivings. These misgivings were not shared by those of us who were aware

that *this* volume was to be edited by Principal Salmond of Aberdeen, and no one will rise from a study of the book without feeling that the work could not have been intrusted to more capable hands. It is not only that the editor has regarded the task as a labour of love and a pious service to the memory of a dear friend, but that he *has appreciated the importance of the work* in a way that some editors of posthumous works have utterly failed to do. The duty assigned to Principal Salmond was not an easy one, as readers of his Preface will learn; but the difficulties have been cheerfully faced and overcome. It may be true that, if Professor Davidson had been spared to carry the book through the press, 'its statements at some points would have been more condensed,' and 'it would have had less of that element of itera-

¹ *The Theology of the Old Testament.* By the late A. B. Davidson, D.D., LL.D., Litt.D., Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Exegesis in the New College, Edinburgh. Edited from the author's manuscripts by S. D. F. Salmond, D.D., Principal of the United Free Church College, Aberdeen. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1904. Price 12s.

tion, of which he made such effective use in his class-room.' Yet who will grudge this iteration in view of the increased clearness it gives to the exposition? Principal Salmond has also wisely introduced editorial notes here and there which are very helpful, and which prevent that sense of bewilderment which, we fear, occasionally fills the minds of non-expert readers of the *Old Testament Prophecy*. The editor's thorough acquaintance with the subject-matter, his sympathy with the spirit of the author, his genius for taking pains, his practised literary aptitude, and his unfailing judgment have combined to produce a volume which is worthy of Professor Davidson, and by which we are willing that the world should judge one of whom Scotland is so proud.

By the time this notice is read the Extra Volume of the *Dictionary of the Bible* will have been published. The Theology of the Old Testament, as treated by Professor Davidson, really amounts to the same thing as the Religion of Israel, a subject on which a very elaborate article has been written for that Extra Volume by Professor Kautzsch of Halle. To the present writer the reading of *The Theology of the Old Testament* has been all the more interesting, owing to the somewhat close attention which he has had recently to give to the article in question. We can hardly imagine anything more instructive or more reassuring than a careful study of these two masterpieces, produced by two men representing the highest scholarship of Great Britain and Germany, both thoroughly imbued with the genuine critical spirit, while at the same time handling their great subject with admirable caution and unfailing reverence.

The Theology of the Old Testament is divided into twelve chapters, of whose contents we propose to give a general account, selecting some points for special notice.

Chapter i., 'The Science of O.T. Theology,' defines clearly the scope of the subject, its relation to O.T. history, etc., and the bearing of literary and historical criticism upon it. Full justice is done by Professor Davidson to the idea of a progressive development of doctrine in the O.T., and to the necessity of revising some former conceptions of what is ancient and what is recent in the text, for instance, of the prophets. But with characteristic caution he reminds us that—

'The literature is very limited. An idea that is found now only in a late writing might really belong to an earlier

time, if we only had a more extensive literature covering that time. But the effect of the criticism [he is probably thinking chiefly of Duhm and Cheyne] referred to is to cut up the writings, particularly the prophecies, into a multitude of fragments, and to introduce the greatest uncertainty into the exegesis. I cannot help thinking that this kind of criticism has gone to extremes in recent times, and has had the effect of discrediting the criticism which is legitimate' (p. 30).

Chapter ii., 'The Doctrine of God,' and the following three chapters dealing respectively with 'The Divine Nature,' 'The Spirit,' and 'The Divine Attributes,' are of fundamental importance. The difference between the modern standpoint and that of the O.T. comes out in the fact that 'it never occurred to any prophet or writer of the O.T. to prove the existence of God.' This, which is a favourite theme with Professor Davidson, is thoroughly elaborated. The important *theologumenon* of the divine 'name' is next handled. This leads naturally to the discussion of particular names of God: *אלהים*, *יהוה*, *אל*, *שדי*, etc. The uncertainty attaching to the original meaning of all these names is evidenced by the circumstance that Professor Davidson declines to formulate a definite conclusion regarding any one of them. If this result should be rather disappointing to eager minds, we can at least assure them that all the material available for reaching a conclusion is set forth by our author. Moreover, the rich spiritual contents that are discovered in the name *יהוה*, as used from the time of Moses onwards, are of more value than mere etymological inquiries (see p. 45 ff.). By the way, there is a valuable editorial note on p. 52 relating to the claim of Hommel and others to have discovered Assyrian forms of the name *יהוה*.

Some readers may be disposed to question whether Professor Davidson does not claim rather too high a character for the earlier stages of the Israelitish religion, and to accuse him of treating somewhat cavalierly the supposition that 'henotheism' or 'monolatry' prevailed in Israel till a comparatively late period. His right will be disputed to speak of David as 'certainly a monotheist,' and to lay so little weight on 1 S 26¹⁹, where banishment from the land of Israel is identified with the worship of other gods (p. 64). It need hardly be said that our author offers weighty arguments for his conclusions on this point, as well as for refusing to yield to the evidence (which is sufficient for Professor Kautzsch) that for a considerable period the belief lingered on

in Israel that Jahweh had a bodily form, and that down to a late period in the history of Judah even the temple contained an image or images of Jahweh. His view on the latter question is in harmony with the fact that throughout the volume he appears to admit of no doubt that the Second Commandment, like the rest of the Ten Words, is Mosaic.

In speaking of the personality and spirituality of God, Professor Davidson writes:

'The idea of some modern writers that the conception of God among the people of Israel was first that of some power external to themselves, which they perceived in the world, a power making for a moral order or identical with it, and which they afterwards endowed with personality and named God, inverts the O.T. representation, according to which the personality of God was the primary idea, and the secondary idea the moral character of this person; for this latter idea, no doubt, became clearer and more elevated. This representation of modern writers to which I have referred is not a historical account of the origin of the conception of God's personality among the people of Israel,—at all events in the historical period which the O.T. embraces. It is rather a description of movements of thought in regard to God; peculiar to modern times, when men, having lost the idea of God's personality which once prevailed, are making a new effort to regain it' (p. 106 f.).

The O.T. doctrine of the 'Spirit of God' is the subject of a very valuable study. At the outset comes a caution which some theologians would do well to ponder:

'The question whether the O.T. teaches the *personality* of the Spirit of God is not one that should be raised apart from the other—What is its *conception* of the Spirit of God? We are very apt to raise these formal questions when we ought first to raise the material ones. The sphere of the O.T. is the practical religious sphere, out of which it never wanders into the sphere of ontology. The whole question is the question of the relation of a living, active, moral, personal God to the world and men. It asks as little what the essence of God is as it asks what the essence of man is' (p. 115).

When he comes to speak of the 'Righteousness of God' (p. 129 ff.), Professor Davidson offers some very needful and wholesome remarks on God's righteousness in relation to His sovereignty, and corrects some very common but mistaken inferences from the illustration of the potter in Jer 18. He is especially careful to point out also that there is no antithesis between righteousness and grace. We often speak of God as righteous or just and yet a Saviour, but the O.T. speaks of God as righteous and therefore a Saviour (p. 144). Regarding the 'Holiness of God' a number of pro-

positions, derived from a careful induction of O.T. passages, are formulated and illustrated. The rise in meaning from a physical and non-moral connotation to the full ethical content of the expression, as employed by the later prophets, is clearly traced, as well as its development along æsthetic and ceremonial lines. In the latter connexion we have the following important pronouncement:

'There was no distinction in the Law between moral and what we have been accustomed to call ceremonial. The idea of ceremonial, *i.e.* rites, such as washings, etc., which have no meaning in themselves, but are performed in order to express or suggest moral ideas, has strictly no existence in the Old Testament. The offences which we call ceremonial were not symbolical, they were real offences to Jahweh, against which His nature reacted; and the purifications from them were real purifications and not merely symbolical. That is, what might be called æsthetic or physical unholiness was held offensive to the nature of God in the real sense, in a sense as real as moral offences were offensive to Him; and the purifications were true removals of these real causes of offence. This æsthetic or physical holiness is an ancient idea. But the prophets made little of it, insisting on moral holiness. On the other hand, the idea receives a great extension in the Law' (p. 159).

Chapters vii. and viii. deal with 'The Doctrine of Man,' and treat first of the O.T. conception of human nature and then of its doctrine of Sin. In examining the sense in which a Biblical Psychology may be spoken of, Professor Davidson expresses doubt whether even in the New Testament the trichotomy of 'body,' 'soul,' and 'spirit,' contended for by many theologians, is anything more than rhetorical. In this matter some will wish that the weight of the great teacher's authority had been thrown on the other side, but there will be only one opinion as to his skilful and informing treatment of the terms 'body,' 'flesh,' 'soul,' and 'spirit.'

Professor Davidson discovers two main lines upon which men in O.T. times thought of what we call 'sin.' These were (1) failure to correspond to an objective standard (this failure being typified by words like חטא), and (2) the assuming of an improper attitude towards another person who is one's superior (this attitude being typified by עָוָה). The latter is the more profoundly ethical idea: 'Sin has reference to God the *Person*, not to His *will* or His *law* as formulated externally' (p. 213). The O.T. notions about universal sinfulness and the connexion between this and the first sin receive very careful and cautious treatment. In this connexion we may note the masterly analysis of Ps 51 (p. 231 ff.).

Chapters viii.-x. are devoted to 'The Doctrine of Redemption.' We have first of all an examination of the signification of the *בְּרִית* or 'covenant' relation in which Israel is represented as standing to Jahweh. It will be very instructive if our readers will compare for themselves Professor Davidson's treatment of this subject with Professor Kautzsch's in the Extra Volume of the *D.B.* (p. 630 ff.).

Here is a passage which may give pause to some. It occurs in connexion with an attempt to reach the original meaning of the root *קָרַשׁ* (p. 257; cf. also what is said in a similar way about the root *צָרַק* on p. 265):

'Etymology is rarely a safe guide to the real meaning of words. Language, as we have it in any literature, has already drifted away far from the primary sense of its words. Usage is the only safe guide. When usage is ascertained, then we may inquire into derivation and radical signification. Hence the Concordance is always a safer companion than the Lexicon.'

The objective value of the O.T. statements about angels, and the precise interpretation to be placed on these statements, are difficult questions, which Professor Davidson handles with characteristic caution. The 'Angel of the Lord' and the 'Satan' afford him an excellent opportunity of exhibiting his power of penetrating into the genesis and development of O.T. conceptions. As a protest against the practical dualism that still prevails in many circles, the following is well timed:

'The element in our idea of a fallen spirit, namely, that he is filled with hatred of God Himself, and an eager desire to counteract His designs, is nowhere visible in the O.T. Perhaps in our popular theology we exaggerate this idea, and give to the kingdom of evil an independence of the divine will, and assign to it an antagonism to God who is over all, which goes beyond what Scripture warrants' (p. 303). Even in the N.T., where there is a greatly developed idea of the power and the malignity of Satan, 'there is no dualism, no power of evil co-ordinate with God: "Greater is He that is in us than he that is in the world" (1 Jn 4th). And this view prevails very strongly in the O.T., and it is not amiss for us to recur to it when weary or like to faint in our minds' (p. 306).

The reader will find it instructive to compare the two following passages regarding the position of the O.T. priest. The first is quoted from Professor Davidson (p. 308), the second is from Professor Kautzsch (see footnote on p. 719a of the Extra Volume of the *D.B.*):

'The parallel may be drawn between the condition of things in Israel and that in the Christian Church. Worship

and mutual edification are the objects had in view by the Christian people, and for these ends they meet in public worship. But it is manifest that the general body must, so to speak, resolve or condense itself into a smaller body of persons who become in a manner its representatives, if these great ends are to be carried out. It was the same in Israel. The priestly body were the representatives of the people. But the existence of the priestly class as representatives of the people did not supersede or absorb the priestly privileges of the individual, any more than the ministry of the Church supersedes the ministry in prayer and exhortation of the father and the individual' (Davidson).

'It needs no argument to show that the parallel it was once customary to draw between the O.T. and the Catholic conception of the priesthood is quite a mistaken one. According to the latter, the priest acts the part of God over against the people, and hence in God's name gives absolution and imparts blessing. On the other hand, in P the high priest is nothing more than a representative—highly exalted and dignified, indeed—of the God-consecrated people. He represents it before God in every regard. Any (ritual) shortcoming on his part involves the whole people in guilt. As to the blessing of Jahweh, again, the high priest, like the other priests, cannot impart this of himself, but must supplicate it of God (cf. Nu 6^{23d}, especially v. 27)' (Kautzsch).

The attempt to trace *sacrifice* to a divine institution, instead of regarding it as a natural expression of man's sense of his relation to God, is of course abandoned by Professor Davidson. The primitive idea underlying the custom of sacrifice is examined, various objections being indicated to the different theories that have been propounded. In this connexion we may mention that our author interprets the famous passage, Jer 7^{21f}, as not amounting to a condemnation of sacrifice in itself, but only of the exaggerated weight laid on it by the people. We confess that we have never been able to convince ourselves that this is all that prophets like Jeremiah mean, or that Hos 6⁶ means only to exalt goodness *above* sacrifice and knowledge of God *above* burnt-offerings. In fact, we are perfectly certain they meant more than this, although we admit that our *hope* that they did may have something to do with our *conviction*.

We would call special attention to the important discussion of the term *כִּפָּר* on p. 320 f. and 327 ff. By the way, is it quite legitimate, in view of some of the offences specified in Lv 6^{1st}, to assert without qualification that only sins of ignorance were capable of being atoned for by sacrifice?

The last two chapters of the book deal with 'The Doctrine of the Last Things,' chapter xi. having for its subject 'The Messianic Idea,' while

chapter xii. is devoted to 'Immortality.' Professor Davidson illustrates very clearly the varying character of the *Messianic* in different ages, the prominent figure being at one time Jahweh Himself, at another the people, at another the Davidic king, at another the priest. The 'Day of the Lord' receives full treatment, special attention being bestowed on the character in which this conception appears in Deutero-Isaiah allied with that of *redemption*. We naturally turn with much interest to Professor Davidson's examination of the development of the O.T. teaching on a *Future Life*. How clearly the difference is brought out between the O.T. ways of thinking of man's future and our ways:

'The chief difference perhaps lies in this, that when the O.T. speaks of immortality, eternal felicity, or what is equivalent to heaven, it usually speaks of the immortality and eternal felicity of the nation. This immortality and felicity shall be entered upon at the manifestation of Jahweh, at the Day of the Lord and His judgment. We, on the other hand, think of the individual and immortality, and apply the latter term to the individual's destiny after death. But in the O.T. the immortality of the people does not raise the question of *death*. There is a change, a being made perfect, an entrance upon a new age—but only a change' (p. 403f.).

Various considerations are urged which help to remove the strangeness of the circumstance that the teaching of the O.T. regarding Immortality is so obscure, or at least so indirect and inexplicit. In particular, we would call attention to the exposition of how the doctrine of retribution, which bulks so largely in our thoughts of a future life, was connected by Israel with the present life ('Behold the righteous shall be recompensed on the earth, much more the ungodly and the sinner,' Pr II³¹; cf. Ps I). How suggestive again are the following remarks:

'We are surprised that the O.T. saint seemed satisfied with the conditions, necessarily imperfect, of a religious life with God upon the earth; that he did not feel the need of a closer fellowship with God than is possible amidst the imperfections of earth; and that dissatisfaction with earth did not lead him to demand, and to believe in, a more perfect condition of existence and a nearer vision of God. Now, in this there may be some imperfection in the manner of thought and feeling of the O.T. saints. Here at least we touch upon a point in which we have been taught to diverge from them, and which in some respects is just the point of difference between the Old Testament and the New. In order to judge these Hebrew saints fairly, however, we must look closely at their way of thinking; and if we do so, perhaps we shall be prepared to admit that we may have diverged

from them, not indeed in fundamental faith, but practically, further than was necessary. We have come to feel strongly the imperfections of the most perfect life upon the earth, and to believe that only in a world that is another can full fellowship with God be found. However true this may be, it is possible that the very axiomatic nature of the truth leads occasionally to an unnecessary disparaging of the possibilities it offers in the way of living to God. . . . The consciousness, [which the O.T. saints have] of God's nearness and fellowship seems to exceed that which men ordinarily have now. We might speculate to what it was due' (p. 411f.).

The conception of Sheol is exhaustively treated. Our author thinks it very doubtful, whether in the O.T. any traces can be discovered of a distinction between the treatment in Sheol of the righteous and the wicked. In answer to the important question whether the O.T. goes any way towards solving the question of the final destiny of the wicked, Professor Davidson finds no indication that it favours either Universalism or Conditional Immortality, or even the notion of a place of repentance and a sphere of development beyond the grave—

'The manner of dying fixes the condition of the dead, and this condition abides. All is yet general; only great principles of moral government appear. But, so far as the O.T. is concerned, no change seems indicated in the state of the unjust, either in the way of release or in the way of an intensification of the evils of Sheol. They die estranged from God, they remain estranged; the estrangement does not appear aggravated into positive misery' (p. 438).

Of Professor Davidson's wonderful power to penetrate into the meaning of the O.T. writers, we have a notable instance in his profound exegesis of Ps 16 (p. 445 ff.). The ideas of an after-life in Psalms 17, 37, 49, and 73 are also subjected to careful scrutiny, and their various solutions of the problem of the sufferings of the righteous and the prosperity of the wicked are clearly characterized. When he passes to the idea of an after-life in Job, our author contributes a very welcome analysis of the contents, and a statement of the problem of the book. Perhaps readers will turn with most interest to see what he discovers in the famous and much controverted passage, Job 19²⁵ ('But I know that my Redeemer liveth,' etc.). It would be impossible in the space at our disposal to give a full account of his explanation, but the following two quotations will indicate the main drift of his conclusions:

'If, as seems necessary, we assume that Job expected this appearance of God on his behalf not previous to his death, we must not attempt to fill up the outlines which he has drawn. We must take care not to complete the sketch out

of events that have transpired long after his day, or out of beliefs reposing on these events that are now current among ourselves. The English version has done so at the expense of the original' (p. 492). 'The vision of his meeting God in peace so absorbed Job's mind, that the preliminaries which would occur to a mind in a calmer condition, and which immediately occur to us, were not present to his thoughts. Yet I do not know but that to Job's mind all the religious essentials were present which we associate with the future life. And though the ancient and traditional interpretation of the passage was in many respects exegetically false, and imposed on Job's mind our more particular conceptions, it seems to me that it seized the true elements of Job's situation in a manner truer to the reality than can be said of some modern expositions' (p. 495).

The twelfth chapter contains, finally, a singularly felicitous and subtle treatment of the Hebrew ideas of Life and Death; the moral meaning of Death, and the reconciliation between the idea of Death and the idea of Life. The volume closes with a classified Bibliography, which will be useful

to the student of O.T. Theology; and two Indexes, the one of Scripture passages, the other of Subjects.

This is probably the volume with which the name of Professor Davidson will come to be most identified. It contains the fully matured fruits of many years' study of the Old Testament, and of practical experience in teaching its theology. Moreover, it is the work of one who brought to the accomplishment of his task a powerful intellect, a well-balanced judgment, and an unsurpassed capacity for entering sympathetically into the thoughts of the writers of Scripture, and for reproducing these in clear and felicitous language. *The Theology of the Old Testament* will take its place in English theological literature as marking the highest level both of scholarship and of religious thought and feeling. It is truly a great work on a great subject.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Harnack's 'Chronologie.'¹

THE first part of Harnack's extremely important work, *Geschichte der altchristlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius* was published as long ago as 1893. Its subject was 'Die Ueberlieferung und der Bestand' (price M.35, bound M.38). The second part, 'Die Chronologie,' commenced with the publication in 1897 of a first volume, under the title, 'Die Litteratur (einschliesslich der neutestamentlichen Schriften) bis zum Ende des zweiten Jahrhunderts' (price M.25, bound M.28). And now we have before us the second volume of the *Chronologie*, which deals with the literature from Irenæus to Eusebius. The character of the previous parts of the work is well known to students of Church History and of Dogma, and the conclusions of Harnack have met with the attention and the discussion to which the eminence of their author entitles them. The same eager study will be given

to the present volume. We had at first intended to go pretty fully into some of Professor Harnack's results, for the information of our readers. For instance, Geffcken's researches on the Sibylline Oracles have led our author to examine afresh the conclusions he had formerly announced regarding the date of the Christian Sibyllines, with the result that he still sees no reason for holding that any of these can be demonstrated to date earlier than the second half of the third century. It will be more fair, however, simply to call attention to the publication of the book before us and leave students to make acquaintance with its contents for themselves. There is no fear of Harnack's monumental work being neglected.

The Works of Eusebius.

THE great edition of the Greek Fathers of the First Three Centuries, published under the auspices of the Royal Prussian Academy of Sciences, continues to make steady progress. The volumes that have already appeared include the works of Adamantius (edited by van de Sande Bakhuyzen), the Book of Enoch (ed. by J. Flemming and L. Radermacher),

¹ *Die Chronologie der altchristlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius*. By Professor A. Harnack, Berlin. Zweiter Band: 'Die Chronologie der Litteratur von Irenæus bis Eusebius.' Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1904. Price M.14.40, bound M.17.40.

Hippolytus' Commentary on Daniel and the fragments of his Commentary on the Song of Songs (ed. by Bonwetsch), the Sibylline Oracles (ed. by J. Geffcken), four volumes of Origen (ed. by Koetschau, Klostermann, and Preuschen), and two volumes of Eusebius (ed. by J. A. Heikel, Ed. Schwartz, and the late Th. Mommsen). The names of the editors are a sufficient guarantee of the quality of the work. It may be taken for granted that this series will take its place as the standard edition of the early Greek Fathers.

And now come other two volumes of Eusebius,¹ containing respectively the *Onomasticon* (ed. by Klostermann) and the *Theophania* (ed. by Hugo Gressmann).

All who have had to study the topography of Palestine and to examine the identifications proposed for biblical sites, know the extreme importance of the *Onomasticon*, and are aware also of the immense services rendered by de Lagarde to the text both of Eusebius and of Jerome. But much has happened since de Lagarde's day, and Klostermann has been able to avail himself of textual apparatus that was not at the disposal of his predecessor. A finely executed map, reproducing the Palestine of the *Onomasticon*, appropriately closes the volume.

Of the *Theophania* of Eusebius it is well known that only some fragments of the Greek original are extant, but a Syriac translation of the whole has come down to us. It need hardly be said that, in his Preface, Dr. Gressmann deals exhaustively with such questions as the genuineness of the *Theophania* as a work of Eusebius, the character and value of the Syriac version, and the relation of the *Theophania* to other works of Eusebius. The German translation (with critical notes) of the Syriac *Theophania* is followed by a series of indexes which materially add to the value of the book. We wish all success to the mag-

nificent series to which the two volumes before us belong.

The Old Testament and Archaeology.

ALL students of the Old Testament are well aware of their increasing obligations to Archaeology, and, *pace* Professor Sayce and some others, even critics of 'Wellhausen's school' are amongst the first to acknowledge that indebtedness. Hence there will be no difficulty in according a hearty welcome to the important work that has just been published by Dr. A. Jeremias,² although he says some hard things of 'critics,' and is not always fair either to their aims, or their contentions. Setting out with the maxim, 'Wer den Dichter will verstehn, muss in Dichter's Lande gehen,' Dr. Jeremias rightly contends that the best light in which to study the O.T. is the light derived from the extant sources that are contemporary with the biblical writings. From some of his remarks one might form the same opinion of him as a few simple-minded people have formed of Professor Sayce, namely, that he is an uncompromising defender of ancient tradition and of the absolutely historical character of all the narratives in Genesis. And, as a matter of fact, this opinion would be much better founded than it is in the case of Professor Sayce. One has only to compare, for instance, the treatment of the story of Joseph by those two archaeologists to discover that the German is far more conservative than the Englishman. Yet we doubt whether either the 'critic' or the 'apologist' will be quite satisfied with the extent to which Dr. Jeremias (following avowedly in the footsteps of Winckler) discovers the 'mythological method of presentation' and the 'mythological system' in the Old Testament. Dr. Jeremias may be quite right in all he says about the astral character of the Babylonian Pantheon and the astral myths of the Babylonian literature, but few, we think, will assent to all his discoveries of a colouring of astral mythology, not only in the patriarchal narratives, but much later in the history. We seem to have, in the procedure of Jeremias and Winckler, another illustration of the tendency to press a

¹ *Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte*. Herausgegeben von der Kirchenväter-Commission der Königl. Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, xi.: Eusebius' Werke, iii. (1) 'Onomasticon der Biblischen Ortsnamen,' von Lic. Dr. Erich Klostermann in Kiel; mit einer Karte von Palästina; (2) 'Die Theophania, die Griechischen Bruchstücke und Übersetzung der Syrischen Überlieferungen,' von Dr. Hugo Gressmann. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs. Price for the two parts, M.17.50, bound M.20.

² *Das Alte Testament im Lichte des alten Orients: Handbuch zur biblisch-Orientalischen Altertumskunde*. Von Dr. Alfred Jeremias, Pfarrer der Lutherkirche zu Leipzig; mit 145 Abbildungen und 2 Karten. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1904. Price M.6.50, bound M.7.50.

principle too far—the same tendency which seems to us to vitiate to some extent even the works of one for whom we have so high a regard as Professor Gunkel. In fairness to Jeremias we must add that he is always careful to insist that the mythologizing tendencies for which he contends, affect only the *form* of the biblical narratives; and that he often cautions us against *resolving facts into mythological ideas*.

In view of what we have said, it will not be wondered at if we recommend readers of *Das Alte Testament im Lichte des Alten Orients* to use the book with caution. Considering the manifold excellences of the work, we are sorry, indeed, to make any reservation. The account of the Babylonian Pantheon and of Oriental non-Biblical cosmogonies is all that could be desired. The superiority of the Biblical to the Babylonian conception of Creation is insisted upon in a way that Professor Friedrich Delitzsch might study with advantage. Dr. Jeremias' cautious methods are well exhibited in his refusal to admit that the oft-cited seal cylinder with the tree between two seated figures, and the serpent in the background, is a Babylonian picture of the Fall. Again, in dealing with the famous 14th chapter of Genesis, he practically admits that the most that Archæology has proved is the correctness of the *milieu* in which Abraham is placed, without having done anything to vindicate the correctness of the rôle assigned to the patriarch. An interesting attempt is made to sketch the political and religious conditions that prevailed in Canaan in the pre-Israelite period. One of the two maps at the end of the volume represents the Canaan of the Amarna period, and the other is a map of the world based upon Gn 10 and upon Darius' list of peoples. After leaving the patriarchal narratives, Dr. Jeremias deals with the Exodus and the story of Moses. The latter leads naturally to a chapter on Israelitish and Babylonian legislation, in which, amongst other points, the ethical character of the Code of Hammurabi is discussed. The remainder of the volume is devoted to archæological glosses (often very helpful) on the rest of the Old Testament in the following groups:—Leviticus—Deuteronomy; Joshua—2 Samuel; 1 Chronicles—Esther; Job—Canticles; Isaiah—Malachi. A very valuable feature of the book is the illustrations, of which there are no fewer than 145. These are not only well executed but, what is rarer, well chosen.

Miscellaneous.

WE have received Nos. 2, 3, 4, and 5 of the 'Hefte,' published in connexion with *Der Christliche Orient*, the monthly organ of the German Orient-Mission, which is edited by Dr. Lepsius. These give full and interesting information on the following subjects:—The Origins of Stundism; Work among the Stundists; The History of the Martyr Mirsa Ibrahim, with some account of the life of Christianized Mohammedans; The Maljowantzi (a Russian sect). The interest of several of the 'Hefte' is heightened by the illustrations that are introduced. Each 'Heft' is published at the low price of 20 pfennigs (Berlin: Verlag der Deutschen Orient-Mission, Lützow-Ufer 5, Berlin, W.10).

From the same source comes *Ex Oriente Lux* (Jahrbuch der Deutschen Orient-Mission; price M.2.80), in which first of all there is an account of the special aims of the Mission and its present needs. Then comes a description of the main tenets of Islam, coupled with an estimate of the present position of Mohammedanism among the religions of the world. After an account of various biblical sites and of the Baghdad Railway, there comes a detailed narrative of the Mission's work in Armenia, with a special chapter on the medical mission.

The well-known series, 'Porta Linguarum Orientalium,' published by Reuther & Reichard of Berlin, has lately received two valuable additions. Dr. Adolf Erman, who had already contributed an *Altägyptische Grammatik* to this series, has now published a *Chrestomathie* (price M.12.50, bound M.13.30), intended for use in the universities and for private study. The work needs, of course, as a companion the same author's *Glossar* (to be published soon) as well as the above-named Grammar. With these three text-books the study of the Egyptian language and literature will become practicable to a degree that has been hitherto unattainable.

The other addition to the series is a second (completely revised) edition of Steindorff's *Koptische Grammatik*, to which is appended Chrestomathy, Vocabulary, and Literature (price M.14, bound M.14.80). The book is designed to meet the wants alike of the student who knows nothing of the older language and of the expert in

Egyptology. The present edition abides by the principle adopted in the former one, to adopt as the basis only one of the Coptic dialects, namely, the Sahidic. Like all the volumes of the *Porta*, the two before us will receive a warm welcome from those for whose use they are designed.

A German play, in which the *dramatis personæ* are Scripture characters, is somewhat of a novelty and rather a hazardous undertaking. Yet Mr. Johannes Arthur has produced in *Jeremia: dramatisches Gedicht in fünf Akten* (Tübingen and Leipzig: J. C. B. Mohr; London: Williams & Norgate; price 1s. 6d.) a work which is interesting and spirited, and which succeeds in no small measure in realizing the original situation. We are certain the book will be read with pleasure.

Dr. Julius Boehmer, whose *Babel-Bibel Katechismus* we noticed some time ago, has published other two useful little works intended 'für Bibel-freunde.' The one is *Neutestamentliche Parallelen und Verwandte aus altchristlicher Literatur* (Stuttgart: Greiner & Pfeiffer, 1903; price 50 pfennigs). The title sufficiently indicates the character and aim of the book, which collects from the early Christian literature all the passages that are best fitted to supplement and to illustrate either the Gospels or the Epistles.

The other work is entitled *Hinein in die alttestamentlichen Prophetenschriften* (price M.3.20). In our own country we have recently seen more than one book published with the special object of teaching people to understand the prophets of Israel. Dr. Boehmer seeks in the work before us to render a similar service in Germany. That the editor of the *Studierstube* has not only the theoretical but the practical qualifications for performing such a task has been shown in many ways. We have the fullest confidence in recommending his book as one of the most reliable and interesting guides in this department of biblical study.

Messrs. Schwetschke & Sohn (Berlin) have issued the first five parts of their very convenient *Bibliographie der Theologischen Literatur* for 1902. The *Bibliographie*, as we have explained before, is simply the list of publications, without the criticisms, contained in the same publishers'

Jahresbericht. It is indispensable for purposes of reference. Each part is published at the remarkably low price of 50 pfennigs.

The admirable series known as 'Der Alte Orient' (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs) continues to maintain its high character. Heft 4 (price 60 pfennigs) of the current issue is entitled *Das Stadtbild von Babylon*. Its author is Dr. F. H. Weissbach, and it contains two plans of the city walls as well as a sketch of a *zikkurat* or storeyed tower.

The *Babel-Bibel* controversy is practically over. And there can be little doubt on which side the victory remains. Ever since Professor Friedrich Delitzsch, to the delight of his enemies and the dismay of those who wished to remain his friends, began to substitute assertion for evidence and abuse for argument, it became plain that he was fighting a losing battle. We wonder how it is that so many archæologists are afflicted in the same way as Delitzsch. We do not imagine for a moment that they are consciously guilty of misrepresentation. But the fact remains that Delitzsch is no more just in his replies to his opponents than our own countryman, Professor Sayce, is to Nöldeke, whose argument about the historicity of Gn 14 was not in the least what Professor Sayce (*Monumental Facts and Higher Critical Fancies*) imagines. Another notable instance of this defect meets us in Mr. Otto Weber's *Theologie und Assyriologie* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs; price 50 pfennigs), a little work which contains much that is valuable and suggestive, but which makes utterly preposterous claims for Assyriology, and shows an inability to appreciate either Old Testament Theology or the work of such representatives of it as Budde, Gunkel, König, and Oettli.

We have had the pleasure of commending to our readers more than one of the works of Professor Bousset of Göttingen. There now lies before us a lecture delivered by him to the Protestantenverein at Bremen last January. It deals with the important question which forms its title, *Was wissen wir von Jesus?* (Halle a. S.: Gebauer-Schwetschke; price M.1). That question had a special interest for Professor Bousset's audience, in view of the wholly negative positions

advocated by Kalthoff in his two works, *Das Christusproblem* and *Die Entstehung des Christentums*, to which the lecture is mainly a reply. But the same question concerns us in this country, and not a few will turn with eagerness to the little work before us to discover what is the historical

value attached to the Gospel narratives and the allusions in the Epistles by so acute a critic as Professor Bousset. We feel sure that the result will be largely reassuring, and that there will be only one opinion as to the high tone and the religious fervour of the author.

The Need of Prophets.¹

BY THE REV. PREBENDARY B. WHITEFOORD, M.A., D.D., PRINCIPAL OF
SALISBURY THEOLOGICAL COLLEGE.

THE passage from which the text is taken is a familiar one to readers of the Old Testament, and will need only a brief introduction.

This chapter describes the discontent of Israel at the difficulties and privations connected with the journey through the wilderness. So acute was it that even the manifest displeasure of Jehovah did not allay it. It broke out again, and this time the ground of complaint was their food. The people greedily specified the dainties of their fare in the land of bondage, and their cries, unmanly, unrestrained, reached Moses. The story of Numbers has often repeated itself. Human beings are not unseldom touched in the matter of eating and drinking. When these appetites are checked, or hampered in free enjoyment, they not only complain, but lose self-control both in little crises of family life and on wider occasions.

With every man a rebel confessed, both against Jehovah and against his appointed leader, the case was a desperate one. There are few passages in Scripture more tragic than the record of the bitter cry for help which Moses raised to Heaven: 'Wherefore layest Thou the burden of all this people upon me? I am not able to bear all this people alone. It is too heavy for me. Now let me die, and let me not see my wretchedness.' It may be that God answered his servant's prayer in a way which was unexpected. He bade Moses choose seventy tried men. To these He promised a special spiritual gift, such as was pre-eminent in

'Would God that all the Lord's people were prophets.'—Num. xi. 29.

Moses, and thus they were to lift the weight of administration off the shoulders of the commander-in-chief. The sign of this gift was prophecy, it may be only once, and there and then exercised.² In any case, it was regarded as a signal token of the indwelling presence of Jehovah, a token also that they were men capable of helping Moses in the task before him.

The appointment of the Seventy was invested with every solemnity. They were directed to station themselves around the front of the Tabernacle. Then Jehovah's Presence was so immediately manifested that the elders accepted it as a convincing proof of the reality of their commission. Then the people in turn received the assurance which they also needed, for the Spirit descended upon the Seventy, and they prophesied.

And here something strange and unexpected occurred. For some unexplained reason two of the Seventy had failed to appear outside the Tabernacle, and had remained behind in the camp. But they were not to lack the gift that had come to their brethren. They too prophesied. This phenomenon caused much excitement. A boy brought the news to Moses; and Joshua, ever jealous for his chief's authority, entreated Moses to prohibit the two from this function. His request met only with reproof, a reproof which reminds us of our Lord's words on a like occasion.

Moses thrust aside any such claim as Joshua would have made for him, he rejoiced in this manifestation of the Spirit, and desired that all

¹ Being a sermon preached in Salisbury Cathedral, Trinity Sunday, 1904, on the occasion of the general ordination of the Bishop of the diocese.

² Nu 11²⁵ (R.V.).

might be partakers of this grace. 'Would God that all the Lord's people were prophets!'

You are too well instructed to suppose that the title prophet always means one who predicts future events. The title bears that meaning fully, absolutely in some passages. But commonly the predictive element lies in the background. But this in no way lessens the dignity of the office. For what was a prophet of the Old Testament? The prophet of course is assumed to have pure lips¹ and a heart right with God. More than this, he also stands as an intimate in God's secret councils.² He is in sympathy with God's purposes, and in turn interprets and declares them to his fellow-men.³ The ideal of the Old Testament is a dispensation in which all the Lord's people would be prophets. The far-reaching mind of Moses saw this. The line, moreover, taken by Moses was thoroughly characteristic of the hero. Our children know that he was called 'meek.'⁴ This might as truly be represented by the word 'disinterested.' All that is told of Moses indicates a withdrawal of himself,⁵ a preference of the cause of his nation to personal interests, which makes him the most complete example of Jewish patriotism. It is only the finer spirits amongst men that can speak and act as he did here. When you and I find ourselves face to face with others exhibiting talents and graces equal or superior to our own—especially when they are younger or occupying less assured positions than we do, when they are possible candidates for the places we fill, how difficult it is to be generous, and how rare a gracious kindly attitude! But not so Moses, 'the man of God.'—'Would God that all the Lord's people were prophets.'

I have roughly and of course inadequately described the prophet of the Old Testament. We might describe the prophet of the New Testament in modern phrases—as a devout, earnest, spiritually minded layman—ready to devote himself to the Church, laying any gifts of intelligence or influence at His Master's feet, pleading with others, speaking to others in the cause of the Faith.⁶ Prophecy in the New Testament implies the consecration of the powers of speech, and surely of the pen also, to the most holy enterprise which man can undertake. The prophetic or preaching function is to-day a pre-eminent task of

the ministry. Woe to it if we elders, or you my younger brethren, ignore or belittle this sacred duty.⁷ I fear that there is some danger of its neglect.

But if the cause of our holy Faith is to be truly advanced, it cannot be too often said it must not be left only to the clergy. The laity must take their part, their just part as prophets. Only rarely did the New Testament prophets belong to the orders of the ministry; but for the most part they would be eminent Christian laymen, illuminated expounders and preachers of the Gospel. In no age of the Church is such active service more deeply needed than in our own, their gifts of intelligence, their power to communicate what they themselves have received of divine revelation. To render such services we all, ministers, laymen, and I would say women also,—for women possessed the prophetic gift in the Apostolic Age,⁸—need to throw off that hampering habit of reserve which clings about us in our religious lives, and to cry boldly: 'O come hither and hearken; and I will tell you what things he hath done for my soul.'⁹

That there is room for what I may now describe as prophetic effort on the part of Christian people is plainly apparent. Not only so, but there is every encouragement to make it. We are told from the pulpit with a melancholy insistence of the mass of indifference to holy things and causes which confronts Christians. It is unhappily true; but it is true mainly of circles that give themselves up wholly to the world. On the other hand, it is equally true that a spirit of inquiry about our Holy Faith is in the air. Men are seeking after God if haply they may find Him.¹⁰ Magazines like the *Expositor* and THE EXPOSITORY TIMES are read by numbers of persons who are not yet wholly obedient to the Cross. The very existence of such a publication as the *Hibbert Journal* points to the fact that the Christian Faith interests and attracts, if it does not win, the highest intellects in our midst.

I beg you Christian people, my brethren the clergy, men and women, rise to the occasion. Let man's necessity for religion to-day be your opportunity. The opportunities are certain to come. If the ministry is never of help to an anxious seeker after Truth, that ministry is so far a failure. If a

¹ Is 6.² Jer 22²².³ Jer 15¹⁹.⁴ Ex 21¹, 14 4¹³.⁵ Nu 12³.⁶ I Co 14³¹.⁷ I Thes 5²⁰.⁸ Ac 21⁹.⁹ P 34¹¹.¹⁰ Ac 17²⁷.

layman is not ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh a reason concerning the hope that is in him,¹ then his own profession of the faith must be weak and halting. The occasion will come.

But for such enterprises a due equipment is needed.

Perhaps the helper must have had his own doubts. We have no record of any value of the later life of St. Thomas, but surely of all in the apostolic college he would be the most helpful to hesitating souls, to seekers after God. At any rate, the helper who is merely a brusque, ill-informed controversialist is worse than useless. Sympathy is imperative. Not of course a sympathy which is prepared to surrender the Christian Faith piecemeal because some of its truths are unpalatable to modern taste. But a sympathy which holds out loving hands to the honest doubter, to those who are well-nigh shipwrecked concerning the faith.² Possibly we have something to learn from a striking movement in other quarters. The Christian Endeavour Society may have far-reaching consequences, as its adherents here and in the United States are increasing with an extraordinary rapidity. We should regard the movement in the temper of Moses. But what we need is not so much another society, as a new spirit of love and of enterprise for the Faith.

It is not needful to speak of spiritual qualifications, for without them any effort on our part for God is doomed to failure, yet an appeal may be made to one and all.

If you would help the doubtful and uncertain, if you would desire, as God gives you occasion, to show them the inherent reasonableness, as well as the beauty and power of the Christian Faith, you must be ever learning more and more about its

¹ 1 P 3¹⁵.

² Ti 1¹⁹.

truths yourselves. For this there is abundant opportunity. The younger clergy should to a man join the Central Society for Sacred Study. I earnestly beg that all who receive holy orders to-day will do so without delay. On you also and others, but especially those about to enter the teaching profession, I would urge the joining the Higher Religious Education Society. It does in this and other dioceses solid unobtrusive work. It teaches, we hope, something of the scientific temper in religion. It certainly helps thoughtful, earnest, religious people to help others.

And for those who cannot join such societies, there is open Christian literature. One of the happiest signs of the times is the publication of works within almost everybody's reach, valuable if slight, on Church History, Christian Evidences, the Book of Common Prayer, and, above all, on the Holy Scriptures. No Christian should declare himself as too busy to read such books. The more they are read the more profoundly interesting they become, and the more fit the readers prove to help forward the cause of the Great Teacher, the teacher of Nicodemus, of the woman of Samaria, and of His own apostle, St. Thomas.—'Would God that all the Lord's people were prophets!'

If only this aspiration were realized to-day! If we Christian people could get the better of our timidity and throw off our reserve, if we would grasp more and more our common cause, if we would seek more and more to know the deep things of God, if we would extend a sympathy, intelligent, and gracious to doubting minds, then, not only would the outlook of the Faith not be despondent, but we should eagerly expect triumphs all along the line, as, like enthusiastic athletes, we strove together for the faith of the gospel.³

³ Ph 1²⁷ συναθρουντες τῇ πίστει τοῦ εὐαγγελίου.

The Writings of the late Professor A. B. Davidson.

BY THE REV. JAMES STRACHAN, M.A., LONDON.

THERE is reason to believe that a dated list of Professor Davidson's numerous articles and reviews, scattered in various publications, together with a complete list of his books, will be useful to readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. The idea, as far as the articles are concerned, has come from

Dr. Driver, who remarks, in a note referring to them, that 'they are difficult to find, and they would be of interest as illustrating his movement in critical opinion.' Such a list is rendered the more necessary by the unfortunate circumstance, that in the posthumous volumes of Dr. Davidson's

writings, edited by Professor Paterson, no attempt has been made to determine the dates of the various lectures and articles.

Dr. Davidson's first publication was the valuable little work entitled *Outlines of Hebrew Accentuation* (1861), shortly followed by his *Commentary, Grammatical and Exegetical, on the Book of Job*, vol. i. (1862). The latter work opened a new era in Scottish biblical scholarship. There is a pioneer note in the vigorous preface of that brilliant youthful work: 'Any exposition now to be valuable, or even bearable, must base itself immovably on Grammar. For Grammar is the foundation of Analysis, Analysis of Exegesis, Exegesis of Biblical Theology, and Biblical Theology of Dogmatics. We in this country have been not unaccustomed to begin at the other end.' But the book met with the cold reception which is apt to be given to pioneer work; vol. ii. never appeared; and for a good many years Dr. Davidson published nothing more.

His first two articles appeared in the *British and Foreign Evangelical Review*—

- 'Palestine Exploration and the Moabite Stone,' vol. xx. [Feb. 1871].
- 'The Servant of the Lord in Isaiah,' vol. xxi. [Oct. 1872].

The second article is a valuable one, containing, as it does, much of Dr. Davidson's distinctive teaching. The following is a characteristic passage: 'As to Babylon being the type of the world, unless the word "type" be used to mean the head and front of the world, such phraseology seems without meaning, or worse. Our theology has become so much in love with representation, that nothing *is* anything whatever any more—it only represents it. . . . What the prophet dealt with was not the representation of things, but the things themselves.'

The following are Dr. Davidson's *Expositor* articles:—

- 'The various Kinds of Messianic Prophecy,' two articles, first series, vol. viii. [1878] pp. 241 and 379.
- 'The Prophet Hosea,' vol. ix. [1879] p. 241.
- 'The Wisdom of the Hebrews,' three articles, vol. xi. [1880] p. 321, xii. pp. 381 and 436.
- 'The Book of Isaiah,' seven articles—
 1. 'The Book of Isaiah, xl.-lxvi,' second series, vol. vi. [1883] p. 81.
 2. 'The Prologue,' second series, vol. vi. [1883] p. 186.
 3. 'Jehovah, God of Israel, the Incomparable,' vol. vii. [1884] p. 81.

- 4. 'Jehovah, the First and the Last,' vol. vii. [1884] p. 251.
- 5. 'Israel, the Servant of the Lord,' vol. viii. [1884] p. 250.
- 6. 'The Servant of the Lord,' vol. viii. [1884] p. 350.
- 7. 'The Work of the Servant of the Lord,' vol. viii. [1884] p. 430.
- 'The Revised Version of the Old Testament: The Book of Job,' two articles, third series, vol. iv. [1886] pp. 274 and 424.
- 'The Prophetess Deborah,'¹ vol. v. [1887] p. 38.
- 'The Prophet Amos'—
 1. 'Jehovah, God of Israel,' vol. v. [1887] p. 161.
 2. 'The People of Israel,' vol. vi. p. 161.
- 'The Book of Proverbs in the Revised Version,' vol. vi. p. 381.
- 'The Prophet Joel,' vol. vii. [1888] p. 198.
- 'Crowned with Glory and Honour,' vol. ix. [1889] p. 115.
- 'The Earlier Ideas of Isaiah,' fourth series, vol. vii. [1893] p. 241.
- 'Modern Religion and Old Testament Immortality,' fifth series, vol. i. [1895] p. 321.
- 'The False Prophets,'¹ vol. ii. [1895] p. 1.
- 'The Word "Atone" in Extra-Ritual Literature,' vol. x. [1899] p. 92.
- 'Uses of Old Testament in Edification,' sixth series, vol. i. [1901] p. 1 [published in *Biblical and Literary Essays*, p. 302 ff.].
- 'Jacob at Peniel,' vol. iii. [1902] p. 176 [not the sermon in *The Called of God*, p. 107 ff., and in some respects more interesting].

Minor articles are reviews of Dr. Frants Buhl's *Canon of the Old Testament*, fourth series, vol. v. [1892] p. 317; of Professor Ryle's *Canon*, vol. vi. p. 79; and of Arthur Davis's *Hebrew Accents*, vol. vi. p. 320.

In the *Encyclopædia Britannica* are the following articles:—

- 'Apocrypha,' vol. iii. [1875] pp. 180-184.
- 'Job,' vol. xiii. [1881] pp. 697-703.
- 'Proverbs,' vol. xix. [1885] pp. 879-883.

In *Chambers's Encyclopædia* are the following:—

- 'Bible,' vol. ii. [1888] pp. 117-129.
- 'Ethiopia,' vol. iv. [1889] pp. 437-439.
- 'Hebrew,' vol. v. [1890] pp. 613-616.
- 'Job,' vol. vi. [1890] pp. 337-339.

In the *Theological Review and Free Church College Quarterly* are the following contributions:—

- Review of Vischer's *Die Offenbarung Johannis eine Jüdische Apokalypse in Christlicher Bearbeitung*, vol. i. [1886] pp. 92-94.

¹ The articles on 'Deborah' and on 'The False Prophets' (see above) are substantially reprinted in the *Old Testament Prophecy* (pp. 30 ff. and 285 ff.), although there is no editorial note to this effect.

Review of Voelter's *Die Offenbarung Johannis Keine ursprünglich Jüdische Apokalypse*, vol. i. [1887] pp. 180-182.

Review of Löwy's attack on the Genuineness of the Moabite Stone, vol. i. [1887] pp. 339-344.

Review of Orelli's *Die Propheten Iesaia und Jeremiah*, vol. ii. [1887] pp. 64-65.¹

Review of Breidenkamp's *Der Prophet Iesaia*, vol. ii. [1887] pp. 65-67.

Review of Delitzsch's *Neuer Commentar über die Genesis und Dillmann's Numeri, Deuteronomium, und Joshua*, vol. ii. [Jan. 1888] pp. 146-155 [important as perhaps the first indication of his accepting Wellhausen's general position, which he is careful to guard against misconception and exaggeration].

'The Second Advent, will it be before the Millennium?', *ib.* p. 255.

Review of Zotenberg's *Histoire d' 'Alâ al-Din*, *ib.* p. 262.

Review of Professor Driver's *Isaiah: His Life and Times*, *ib.* pp. 336-337.

'Some Recent Books on Ecclesiastes,' vol. iii. [1888] pp. 1-20.

[This fine article should have been reprinted in the volume of *Biblical and Literary Essays*. It is one of Dr. Davidson's most characteristic productions. His rapier-like thrusts of criticism—M. Renan and Dr. Plumptre are the victims,—his delicate irony, his tender humanity, his exquisite moral and spiritual insight, his charm of style, are all apparent here. There was something in Professor Davidson's temperament which brought him into close rapport with the author of 'Ecclesiastes,' and his distinctive view of this Book, so different from the ordinary travesties, is one of great and enduring importance, and ought to have found a fitting place in his posthumous works.]

Review of Cheyne's *Hallowing of Criticism*, vol. iii. [Nov. 1888] p. 62.

Review of Professor G. A. Smith's *Isaiah*, vol. iii. pp. 151-152.

Review of Dr. Cheyne's *Jeremiah*, vol. iii. pp. 153-154.

Review of Schultz's *Alttestamentliche Theologie*, vol. iii. pp. 176-177.

Review of Professor Workman's *The Text of Isaiah*, vol. iii. pp. 246-252.

Review of Menzel's *Der Griechische Einfluss auf Prediger und Weisheit Salomo's*, vol. iii. pp. 264-265.

Review of Dr. Milligan's *The Book of Revelation*, vol. iv. [1889] pp. 35-40.

Review of Edkins' *Evolution of the Hebrew Language*, iv. [Feb. 1890] p. 145.

Review of Delitzsch's *Messianische Weissagungen in geschichtlicher Folge*, iv. [April 1890] p. 261.

Review of Ball's *The Prophecies of Jeremiah*, vol. iv. [1889] pp. 262-263.

¹ In the course of this notice Professor Davidson, while declaring that Orelli's language about the LXX text of Jeremiah is 'stronger perhaps than is necessary,' characteristically adds: 'The Septuagint threatens to come in like a flood, and if a man erects a dyke against its coming in at all, we quite well understand him. Still, a little of the Septuagint may fertilize, though more than a little may drown.'

Review of Dr. Driver's *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel*, vol. iv. [1889] pp. 263-264.

Review of Delitzsch's *Commentar über das Buch Iesaia*, vol. iv. [1889] pp. 274-276.

Review of Kuenen's *De Prophetische Boeken*, vol. iv. [1889] pp. 277-280.

The following reviews are in the *Critical Review* :—

Review of Riehm's *Alttestamentliche Theologie*, vol. i. [1891] pp. 28-35.

Review of Reuss's *Geschichte der Heiligen Schriften des Alten Testaments*, vol. i. [1891] pp. 241-246.

Review of Taylor's *Micah*, vol. i. [1891], pp. 375-377.

Review of Gautier's *Ezekiel*, vol. i. [1891], pp. 377-380.

Review of Cornill's *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, vol. ii. [1892] pp. 31-32.

Review of Löhr's *Die Klagelieder des Jeremias*, vol. ii. [1892] pp. 33-35.

Review of Bevan's *Daniel*, vol. ii. [1892] pp. 142-143.

Review of Duhm's *Das Buch Iesaia*, vol. iii. [1893] pp. 12-20.

Review of Smend's *Alttestamentliche Religionsgeschichte*, vol. iv. [1894] pp. 12-18.

Review of Kuenen's *Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, vol. iv. [1894] pp. 355-357.

Review of Kautzsch's *Psalmen*, vol. iv. [1894] p. 357 ff.

Review of McCurdy's *History, Prophecy, and the Monuments, Part I*, vol. v. [1895] pp. 3-9.

Review of Dr. Driver's *Leviticus* and Budde's *Samuel*, in Haupt's 'Sacred Books of the Old Testament,' vol. v. [1895] pp. 347-349.

Review of Charles's *Ethiopic Version of the Hebrew Book of Jubilees*, vol. v. [1895] pp. 350-352.

Review of Kittel's *History of the Hebrews*, vol. vii. [1897] pp. 12-16.

Review of Clemen's *Der Gebrauch des Alten Testaments in den Neutestamentlichen Schriften*, vol. vii. [1897] pp. 69-70.

Review of Budde's *Das Buch Hiob*, vol. vii. [1897] pp. 421-430.

Review of McCurdy's *History, Prophecy, and the Monuments, Part II*, vol. vii. [1897] pp. 430-432.

Review of König's *Historisch-Comparative Syntax der Hebräischen Sprache*, vol. viii. [1898] pp. 418-419.

Review of Duhm's *Psalmen*, vol. x. [1900] p. 446 ff.

Review of McCurdy's *History, Prophecy, and the Monuments, Part III*, vol. xi. [1901] pp. 387-393.

In *Book by Book* [1892] are Introductions to Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs.

In Wright's *Illustrated Bible Treasury* [1896] are the following :—

'The Book of Job,' pp. 85-86.

'Proverbs,' pp. 90-91.

'Ecclesiastes,' pp. 91-93.

'The Song of Songs,' pp. 93-94.

In Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible* are the following :—

'Angel,' vol. i. [1898] pp. 93-97.

'Covenant,' vol. i. [1898] pp. 509-515.

- It was no light task which was assigned to the editor. The laborious mechanical part of the work has been very carefully done. But serious difficulties which required to be grappled with, and if possible overcome, seem scarcely to have been looked at. The volume contains twenty-four lectures, the earliest of which was probably written nearly forty years before the latest. During all that time the writer's mind was steadily growing and his views were gradually changing. To edit

these lectures, so diverse in character, without making any attempt to determine the approximate dates of their composition, is not only bewildering to the reader but unfair to the writer. The editor had a fine opportunity of applying the well-known principles of historical criticism to the documents he had in hand. He might without much trouble have thrown upon each lecture the light which the reader required to possess in order to read it with a due appreciation of its contents. Dr. Davidson's pupils treasured their notes of his lectures; some of them took copious shorthand reports; and by a few inquiries the editor might have satisfied himself as to the time when certain lectures began to be delivered, and when others—of which there is a considerable number in the *Old Testament Prophecy*—fell into desuetude. The editor has far too readily despaired of being able to solve these problems. He has not even reproduced the dates of the articles which appeared in the *Expositor*.

Other things should have been done in the *Old Testament Prophecy* to facilitate the work of the reader. The table of 'Contents,' is far too meagre, and repels one at the very outset. The twenty-four chapters should have been carefully grouped. *E.g.* the three chapters on Messianic Prophecy ought to form one section, and with these Dr. Davidson always associated, as a matter of course, the three closely allied lectures on the Messianic Psalms, 2, 72, 110, which the editor has torn from their organic connexion and published in the *Biblical and Literary Essays*. A descriptive headline on each page would have been more serviceable than the monotonous reiteration of the titles—not always well chosen—of the successive chapters. And the 'General Index' seems to be far from complete; *e.g.* under the heading 'Delitzsch' there should have been references to pp. 393 and 447, and under 'Ewald' to 388.

The still more serious misplacement of the admirable lectures on Amos, Hosea, and Joel is peculiarly misleading. For many years Dr. Davidson was in the habit of lecturing—near the beginning of his course—on these three as representative prophets, using their writings for concrete illustrations of the principles he taught. It is a singular error of judgment to take the lectures on Amos and Hosea out of their natural and obvious connexion and publish them in another volume among essays with which they have little or no affinity. It completely

spoils the perspective of Dr. Davidson's prophetic course. For some inscrutable reason his excellent lecture on Joel is not reprinted at all.

The articles on 'the various kinds of Messianic Prophecy,' as they appear in the *Expositor*, begin with this sentence: 'In the following papers I mean to make some observations on a single point in connexion with Messianic Prophecy, on which the language employed by writers on prophecy, when treating on it, has always appeared to me obscure.' This sentence, with its modest insistence on the 'single point,' so finely characteristic of the writer, is omitted in the *Old Testament Prophecy*, with the result that we imagine that we are about to read a treatise on the whole subject of Messianic Prophecy. No doubt the articles in question give us more insight into Messianic Prophecy than many books dealing professedly with the subject as a whole; but that is another matter. The point is that Professor Davidson would have deleted any sentence rather than this particular one.

The publication of the lectures on 'Elijah,' 'The Call of Isaiah,' 'Waiting upon God,' 'The Call of Jeremiah,'—without a note as to their real nature,—as if they were *sermons*, creates quite a wrong impression, and, of course, still further impoverishes the *Old Testament Prophecy*. These were ordinary class lectures. I heard them all delivered as such. Many will remember them as the finest things they listened to in their New College curriculum. That Dr. Davidson was an eminent preacher, and that he occasionally gave these lectures in churches, is certainly true; but he was first and foremost a professor; and the publication of these lectures in their only proper place, in the *Old Testament Prophecy*, was needed to convey a just and adequate impression of the quality of that quiet college work in which he was supremely great and influential.

We are expressly told by the editor of the *Old Testament Prophecy* that his idea is to present Dr. Davidson's views of 'prophecy in general.' This innocent phrase betrays a very complete misunderstanding of all Dr. Davidson's habits of mind. He would have poured scorn on 'prophecy in general.' His *bête noire* was a generality. He never enunciated a principle without illuminating it by many concrete instances. While the editor of *Old Testament Prophecy* attempts to divorce the general from the particular, the mere titles of Dr. David-

son's course of lectures for any one session would have shown how closely he always kept the two joined together. Had the editor ascertained—as he might easily have done—and rigidly adhered to Professor Davidson's own methods, he would have edited, in two volumes, a work on Old Testament Prophecy which would have gone down to posterity as a much worthier memorial of a teacher whose mind was the finest religious instrument which God gave to Scotland during the second half of the nineteenth century.

The articles printed in *Biblical and Literary Essays* seem to have been thrown together in a haphazard way. 'Mohammed and Islam' and 'Arabic Poetry' are sandwiched between 'The English Bible and its Revision' and 'Modern Religion and Old Testament Immortality.' Some of them might easily have been dated. 'Mohammed and Islam' was delivered to the New College Missionary Society on 8th March 1884. It was a memorable lecture, especially the last part of it, in which Dr. Davidson spoke of the best means of overcoming the prejudices of Islam. The substance of this sentence is impressed on one's memory: 'Such philanthropists as Livingstone

and Gordon may by and by suggest a new and deeper conception of human life, and, with it, of Christianity.' When we afterwards discussed the lecture—as everything that Professor Davidson said was keenly debated—it was General Gordon's great name that we dwelt upon. It gives one a pang of regret to find that this name is now omitted. Did the lecturer extemporize it in the delivery (an extremely rare thing with him), or did he once write it, and afterwards delete it for some reason which it would be difficult to surmise?

In taking leave of our subject we should like to direct the attention of our readers to Mr. Taylor Innes' 'Biographical Introduction' prefixed to *The Called of God*, and to two articles by Professor G. A. Smith in the *Biblical World* (Chicago), September 1902, p. 167 ff., and October 1902, p. 288 ff., which are important both for reminiscences of Professor Davidson's teaching, etc., and also for tracing his critical development.¹

¹ As it is very desirable that the list of Professor Davidson's articles should be both accurate and complete, it will be esteemed a favour if readers of the above article will send any corrections or additions to the Editor of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, St. Cyrus, Montrose.

At the Literary Table.

ST. PAUL'S ESCHATOLOGY.

ST. PAUL'S CONCEPTIONS OF THE LAST THINGS. By the Rev. H. A. A. Kennedy, M.A., D.Sc. (*Hodder & Stoughton*. 7s. 6d. net.)

WHEN Dr. Kennedy offered 'St. Paul's Eschatology' for the Cunningham Lectureship, he knew both himself and the subject. He knew that there was no subject within the range of theology more broken down. But he knew that he could set it on its legs again.

His book will not be found easy reading. That is, however, no fault of his. It is due to the disastrous state into which St. Paul's doctrine of the last things had fallen. We have so much to unlearn before we can learn, so many words to lose the wrong meaning of before we get at their right meaning. It is a book that will cost the reader something as well as the writer. But

what it costs will be repaid. The good got out of it will probably be in exact proportion to the pains spent upon it.

There are features of Dr. Kennedy's Cunningham Lectures which suggest German work. But it is not German. Is it insular pride that makes us think the Continental scholar cannot see his book for its pages? Dr. Kennedy is a critic, but criticism is an instrument not an end with him. He is a philologist, an exegete, an expositor; but he is above himself in all these capacities. He sees more than his immediate work. He sees the use of St. Paul's eschatology, its spiritual, soul-saving, eternity-grasping use, while he hammers it out of the grammatical rock or digs it out of the Rabbinical pit. The German is content to set the grammar right; the Englishman (with apologies to Dr. Kennedy's Celtic ancestry) is interested in the use of *δέ* in the New Testament because it leads to life eternal.

ROBERT ADAMSON.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF MODERN PHILOSOPHY. By Robert Adamson, M.A., LL.D.
 Edited by W. R. Sorley, M.A., LL.D.
 (Blackwood. Two Vols. 18s.)

The story that Wordsworth said he could write plays like Shakespeare's if he had a mind, and that Lamb said, 'You see it is only the mind that is wanting,' recurs to one who reads these volumes. It is all so easy to write on Modern Philosophy. It is so easy to trace its development and describe each philosopher's contribution. It is so easy to handle the words which different philosophers used in different senses and never mix their meaning nor mistake it. It is so easy to deliver a whole course of fresh informing lectures on the 'Development of Modern Philosophy,'—it is so easy that we could do it if we had a mind.

Professor Adamson was born to do it. His perseverance, his unselfish, plodding perseverance did it, but he was born with that. His love of thinking did it, his perpetual turning and turning of problems in his mind did it; but he was born with that also. His honest desire to know, his sense of the greatness of knowledge, his belief in the realism and the idealism of things did it, but he was born even with that. It was his nature to be a philosopher, and he loved philosophers by nature so generously, that he was born not only to be a philosopher but an expositor of philosophers.

Professor Adamson had one defect. His mind was too orderly. He could not bear confusion. Obscurity of any kind was hateful to him. So he made the philosophers too comprehensible and he lost the Incomprehensible Himself—lost Him a little in his thinking, we say nothing of course of his life. We do not commend a disorderly mind; but a mind which rejects everything that it cannot reduce to order is a dangerous, punishable mind. Professor Adamson was punished. He would have been no philosopher and no expositor of philosophers if he had not believed in philosophy; but he was punished for believing that there was nothing in heaven and earth that had not been dreamt of in philosophy.

Professor Sorley is the editor. If the lectures are clear, orderly, interpretative, he has taken away nothing from these qualities, and he has added to them sympathy, humanity, warmth, the

glow of friendship, the charm of knightly admiration. Philosophers are sometimes a trifle agnostic towards God, but very appreciative of man.

AUGUSTE SABATIER

THE RELIGIONS OF AUTHORITY AND THE RELIGION OF THE SPIRIT. By the late Auguste Sabatier. (Williams & Norgate. 8vo. 10s. 6d.)

Auguste Sabatier became fairly well known to English readers by the translation of his book, *Outlines of a Philosophy of Religion*. It was a catching book. There seemed to be something good in it. There was something refreshingly new in the opening chapters of it. But it was a disappointment. The freshness did not seem to last. The new did not seem to be substance. It was a new way of putting things, the things themselves were not new. And its great idea that the kernel of truth is always true, while all the forms in which it has manifested itself are husks, to be cracked and thrown away, was far too difficult and far too dangerous an idea for general acceptance.

The new book is better. It is the last. Sabatier died before it was published. The duty of seeing it through the press has been piously fulfilled by his widow. It is a better book and a greater. Its title at once declares its correspondence with the *Outlines* in general purpose. There are religions, so-called, which depend for their success on outward forms, organization, ceremonies, superstitions; and there is one only living and true Religion, the Religion that rises in the heart itself in immediate contact with the living Spirit of God.

This real Religion is the religion of experience. But experience is not an historical thing. My past experience may be wrong, as indeed so may every form in which I try to fix and express my present experience. Thus the historical is always temporary and unreliable. The Church is a great hindrance to the attainment of truth, a great enemy to the true Religion, just because the Church is stereotyped form, because it has a history and ceremonies, and pays attention to these things. These things should have no attention. The spirit should meet the living Spirit of God without rite or memory or any such thing.

The dialogue is out of fashion to-day and will not help the book. But the book will be read, and well deserves it. If it is read it will have great

influence on the future of Religion. For the heart of man will know that what it says is true.

Mr. Allenson has published a new cheap and attractive edition of Bishop Boyd Carpenter's *Thoughts on Prayer* (1s. net).

One does not expect much from a title like *The Eternal Will*, and no more from a sub-title like 'A Study in the Interpretation of Life.' The little words *Will* and *Life* are too big for titles and for books. One may so easily say anything and so say nothing about them. Still we have been taken hold of by a book with such a title and sub-title, written by Mr. J. S. Stanyon, M.A., and published by Mr. Allenson. For a serious conscious effort is made in it to catch the two facts of religion, experience and history, and get them to plough together.

Great Souls at Prayer is the popular title of Miss M. W. Tilestone's collection of prayers from St. Augustine to Robert Louis Stevenson. Popular, for the book has reached its seventh thousand already. There are many prayers in it by Christina Rossetti, and they are prayers. This one is characteristic: 'O Lord, strengthen and support, I entreat Thee, all persons unjustly accused or underrated. Comfort them by the ever-present thought that Thou knowest the whole truth, and wilt in Thine own good time make their righteousness as clear as the light. Give them grace to pray for such as do them wrong, and hear and bless them when they pray' (Allenson).

Messrs. Bagster have launched a new series of what are called bijou books, the title being 'Christian Ideals.' Two volumes (though it seems absurd to call these toys volumes) are out. *The Christian Workman*, by John C. Lambert, B.D., and *The Christian Knight* by Robert J. Drummond, D.D. (1s. each).

'The Vedast Missal; or, Missale Parvum Vedastinum, a xiii. Cent. MS., probably Flemish, but containing the germ of the subsequent English uses, Edited with Notes and Facsimile by Zouch H. Turton,'—that is the story of the title-page. The printing has been done for the author in Great Yarmouth (which is a pity, for some of the letters are broken and all are a little blurred), but

it is published in London by Mr. Thomas Baker of Soho Square, W.

THINGS FUNDAMENTAL. By C. E. Jefferson (*S. C. Brown*. Crown 8vo, pp. 372. 6s.).—Mr. Jefferson is the pastor of Broadway Tabernacle in New York City. The things fundamental upon which he writes are Faith, Reason, Uneasiness, Scripture, Christ's Divinity, Miracles, Forgiveness, Punishment, the Church, Immortality, and the Holy Spirit. He writes with knowledge, especially modern knowledge, and with conviction, most unmodern but most welcome conviction. The best chapter, the chapter that is most modern and most convincing, is that on Punishment. There is no subject of theological thought on which men in modern times have so far left their fathers' position. We actually do not now believe that God's chief business is to punish the ungodly. We do not believe that He has any pleasure in the death of the wicked. Ah, well, that is not so very modern. It was known long ago. But our fathers would not believe it. His chief business, they held, was to see after Hell. He was a 'God of the underworld' to them. He does see after Hell. But His chief business, now we know, is to open the kingdom of Heaven to believers, His chief delight is in mercy.

A FOURTEENTH CENTURY ENGLISH BIBLICAL VERSION. Edited by Anna C. Paues, Ph.D. (Upsala), Fellow of Newnham College, Cambridge (Cambridge: *At the University Press*. 8vo, pp. lxxxvi, 264. 10s. net).—It is impossible to say much about this book without free quotation, but all that can be said must be appreciative. It is the finest work of a true scholar and of a great publishing house. Which shall we rejoice most in, the minute knowledge discovered in the Introduction or the faultless beauty of the printing?

It is a version of the Catholic and Pauline Epistles and the Acts, with a prologue on the early narratives of Genesis and a dialogue between a 'lewed and unkunnynge' brother and sister, that is, a monk and nun, on the one hand, and their Superior on the other. Miss Paues has worked it off the five MSS in which it has been more or less preserved, and produced a book which must be named and consulted in all future work on the English Bible.

With what earnestness of purpose, and with what scientific precision of purpose, do the great American Churches educate their young in the things of the Bible and of Christ. How lamentably do we in this country lag behind. Course after course of instruction, book after book, is published. The demand rises with the supply, and they have much cause for rejoicing. The latest is a volume for the elementary division. It is written by Georgia Louise Chamberlin, and published at the Chicago University Press. Its title is *An Introduction to the Bible for Teachers of Children*. It belongs to the series of 'Constructive Bible Studies,' edited by W. R. Harper and E. D. Burton, in which that great and well-known book has already appeared, Burton and Mathews' *Principles and Ideals for the Sunday School*.

MAN PREPARING FOR OTHER WORLDS. By W. T. Moore, M.A., LL.D. (St. Louis: *Christian Pub. Co.* \$2).—Dr. Moore will be remembered as the long-time and capable editor of the *Christian Commonwealth*. His new book is his best book. He has thrown himself into it, sparing nothing. Whatever he believes or hopes for in this world or the world to come is set down here. It is the book of the gospel—the gospel for the man in the street. 'We have all sinned and come short of the glory of God, and the Cross is the only effectual remedy for this sin; and when this fact is fully realized, then the word of the Cross is no longer foolishness, but is the power of God unto salvation unto every one that believeth, to the Jew first and also to the Greek.'

The eleventh (which must be the next to last) part of the Oxford Hebrew Lexicon (Clarendon Press; 2s. 6d.) has been published. It needs only this mere notice. No Hebrew student can do without this Lexicon. It is as thorough and as good to read as Murray's English Dictionary.

Another volume has been published of Sander's and Kent's 'Messages of the Bible' (James Clarke & Co.; 3s. 6d. each). It is *The Messages of the Psalmists*. Its author is Professor J. E. M'Fadyen of Toronto. It was a fine compliment to Canada to send the Psalter there. Professor M'Fadyen has done his work so that there will be no repentance on the editors' part. He has caught the spirit of the series; more than that, he has caught

the spirit of the Psalmists. It is not the old style commentary—which surely is played out now—the style of merely verbal notes, after the manner of the Shakespeare commentaries for schoolboys. We know that 'blessed' means happy, but we are no happier for the knowledge. The Psalmists tried to make us blessed. That is also what in his modern scientific way Professor M'Fadyen does.

PSYCHIC POWER IN PREACHING. By J. Spencer Kennard, D.D. (*Hodder & Stoughton*. 5s.).—There is a dread which has sometimes visited us that the day may come when the American language will have to be translated into English, and the English into American. Already there are words—oh, the spelling 'honor,' 'center,' and all that, is nothing—but there are words which we do not use at all, and do not know the meaning of. Psychic power? Is it power over souls, we wonder, for we have Greek enough to know that *psyche* is the soul. Then, is it over the soul to rescue it, when the soul will mean the life; or over the soul to move it, when the soul will mean the emotions? Psychic Power in Preaching—Dr. Kennard never explains. His American readers know. He just writes a good book on Preaching, marked by fervour and much common sense.

THE LETTERS OF JOHN HUS. By Herbert B. Workman, M.A., and R. Martin Pope, M.A. (*Hodder & Stoughton*. 6s.).—It is an extraordinary thing that never till now have the letters of John Hus been properly translated into English. Only one translation appears to be in existence, Mackenzie's, published in Edinburgh in 1846. But Mackenzie's edition is a translation of a French translation, and that French translator used a very imperfect copy to work from. But now is the reproach removed. Two young Wesleyan scholars have done it. A better association in Literature than these two could not be found, for one is the ideal translator, the other the ideal annotator. Now the greatness of Hus will make its immediate impression on ordinary English folk, and surely also something of the greatness of the cause for which Hus died.

STUDIES IN THE RELIGION OF ISRAEL. By the Rev. L. A. Pooler, B.D. (*Hodder & Stoughton*. 5s.).—In his preface Canon Pooler names some of the teachers of the critical theory

of the Old Testament, and he contrives to make a surprising number of mistakes. Professor John Patrick does not teach the Old Testament; Professor G. G. (not G. C.) Cameron would emphatically decline to be classed among the critics, and his College is no longer the Free Church College; Professor Nicol does not teach the Old Testament; Professor Whitehouse is not A. C., nor Professor Skinner T; Professor Curtis of Yale does not spell his name Curteis, and Professor Moulton of the same University is a New Testament teacher, and has shown no leanings in the critical direction. What do we expect of a writer who can begin in this way? Not accuracy in minutiae, and we do not get it. But we get an extremely vivid description, in its broad striking aspects, of what criticism makes of the Old Testament and the Old Testament religion. We get it expressed in words that are pictures, and in images that take hold. Canon Pooler will never be a critic; he is come to make criticism popular. The men who are in a hurry will find that he wastes no time, and tells a clear and fearless story.

THE CENTURY BIBLE (*Jack*. 2s. 6d. net).—Dr. Adeney is an ideal editor of a series. He secures the best men for his purpose, and he secures their work in time. Month after month comes out in regular succession a volume of the Century Bible, and every volume rises to our expectation. Dr. Horton is a good choice for the Minor Prophets. He uses the best sources, and he is deliberately and confessedly neither for the old school of interpretation nor for the new, but regards 'with equal admiration' the work of both.

Still better is the choice of Professor W. T. Davison for the Psalms, of which this is the first volume. Dr. Davison has not Dr. Horton's eye for immediate effect, but he can place himself in the Old Testament environment, and he knows the literature. If Dr. Horton helps to make the Minor Prophets Londoners, Dr. Davison helps to make the Londoners Minor Prophets.

'Into all the world.' So Mr. C. S. Macalpine calls his appeal for more labourers, and more prayer for the labourers (*Marshall Brothers*; 1s. net).

Messrs. Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier have published a little book on *Joining the Church* (3d.).

It is the first of a series of five by the Rev. William Watson, M.A., of Trinity Presbyterian Church, Birkenhead. It is very simple and very suitable. But why does Mr. Watson lose half his power by encouraging the use of such an expression as 'joining the Church'? He has not once reminded his young people that they are members of the Church already. What does Baptism mean? Mr. Watson is a Presbyterian. It does not mean regeneration. Does it not mean membership in the visible Church and a right to all its privileges? This membership need never be repudiated, but the heart may open in response to the working of God's Spirit, and the young person is regenerated and now will remember at His Table the dying love of Christ. But 'joining the Church'?—surely that is only for those who *have* repudiated their membership and have to be restored to Privileges.

THE SACRAMENTAL SABBATH IN THE FREE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND. By the Rev. Patrick W. Robertson, M.A. (*Oliphant*. 3s. 6d. net).—This is as fine a book as the spring season has given us. It is theological for those who love to think of God; it is antiquarian for those who love the old paths; it is experimental for those who would live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world. The whole flavour of the old fashion in Scottish Communion is reproduced in it, the flavour of all that was deepest, richest, most enduring in Scottish life—gone now, gone for this generation utterly, though not for ever, driven away by the increase among us of men and women who are lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God.

IMMORTALITY A RATIONAL FAITH. By William Chester (*Revell*. Crown 8vo, pp. 207. 3s. 6d. net).—If it is ever of any service to man to try to prove man's immortality, then this is the book that will render that service. The old lines of proof have passed away, behold all these proofs are new and very scientific. But *is* it of any service? Suppose man is immortal, and not in Christ? Is he better to know it? And can it be done? Can you prove to any man that he is immortal unless he has first found Christ? The wise men have been trying it from the beginning, and they have had no success. Paul does not

prove man's immortality. He has found Christ and *is* immortal, that is the difference.

Now do not let us disparage a book which has been so pleasant to read—a book, too, that will render a real service to those who are seeking the Lord, if haply they may be found in Him. It is a book to quieten the heart even of the doubting and distressful believer.

The new and the most productive feature of the Rev. Lonsdale Ragg's *Evidences of Christianity* (one of Rivington's 'Oxford Church Text-Books') is the recognition that the Christian Revelation has its rivals. That is a long and valuable chapter. If it could have been longer it would have been more valuable.

THE DIVINE PROVIDENCE. By Oscar D. Watkins (*Rivingtons*. 3s. 6d.).—The pressing problems of to-day are all problems of providence. The dilemma is, 'If God is good, He is not great; if He is great, He is not good.' And it has the advantage of being intelligible to everybody. No off-hand answer will suffice. The whole problem is dealt with in a capable, careful way by this writer. He walks warily, step by step, in short chapters. And we can walk with him, for he has the gift of style. The book is most unreservedly to be recommended to any one who wants to know, if not a sparrow falls to the ground without our Father, what the sparrow-hawk is for.

THE LOST ARTICLE OF THE CREED. By the Rev. F. B. Proctor, M.A. (*Simpkin*. 5s.).—The lost article is the Descent into Hell. Mr. Proctor would say 'into Hades,' for this is one of the matters he is earnest about, that Hades is not Hell, and even when we read 'The wicked shall be cast into Hell,' we read far more into the words than we have any right to do. The book is not simply an exposition of that article in the Creed, however. It is an exposition of the State after Death, according to modern knowledge both of God and Scripture. We need not look for startling heresies in the book; Mr. Proctor has no joy in revolution. But we may look for a silent upheaval of all the old fond nonsense

which bad exegesis and bad hearts took out of the words of the prophet and apostle. It is a study in the things beyond the tomb which teachers and preachers will find wonderfully suggestive. We have lost the use of this weapon. We cannot get people to rush into Heaven that they may escape Hell. Mr. Proctor will restore it to our hand.

ONE HUNDRED QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS. By W. T. Nicholson, B.A. (*Sonnen-schein*).—Mr. Nicholson should be made the editor of the correspondence column in some leading religious paper. He can make the questions as well as the answers. He can make both very cleverly and very helpfully.

Mr. Elliot Stock has published a third and complete edition of Mr. F. J. Gant's *The Lord of Humanity* (2s. 6d. net).

That original and useful Sunday School book, *Through Eye to Heart*, has been followed by another called *The Gospel by Signal*. Mr. Webster has signalled by flags, and Mr. Dryburgh has described it all evangelically (*S. S. Union*; 1s. 6d. net).

Messrs. Williams & Norgate have published the second volume of Professor Paul Wernle's *Beginnings of Christianity* (10s. 6d.). It is the more startling volume of the two; it is the less worthy. The great discovery of Professor Wernle is that the Fourth Gospel is St. Paul's—not his authorship but his theology. Now at last, he says, St. Paul's theology is made to issue from the mouth of Jesus Himself. St. John is St. Paul! St. John's 'I am come that they may have life and may have it abundantly' is St. Paul's 'justification by faith' put into the mouth of Jesus! In Professor Wernle's own plain language, 'one must have a considerable dose of credulousness' to believe it.

Of course the book is well worth reading. Its life, its vigorous, frank, modern repudiation of all traditionalism, make it good reading and good for us to read it. But it will not stand. Wernle has not written his best book yet.

The Poetry and the Wit of Jeremiah.

BY THE REV. D. MACRAE TOD, B.D., LOGIEALMOND.

JEREMIAH is, in some respects, the greatest of the prophets, and the most neglected. By his life he suggests to our minds the noblest conception of the Old Testament, 'The suffering servant of Jehovah,' and by his words he reveals the new and more glorious covenant between God and men. But in spite of all this he is neglected.

This neglect must be largely ascribed to the style in which much of the book is written.

The sadness and sombreness of Jeremiah's style are natural to a high-strung man living in a doomed country among a panic-stricken people. With no hope from man, and with the heavens black as midnight overhead, the prophet cannot give us the purple patches of the royal Isaiah, or the hope-stirring poetry of him who sang in the land of exile, when the dawn of a better day was already breaking. Nevertheless, a sad style, however natural, soon tires an ordinary reader.

In addition, there is found in Jeremiah a redundancy that is most trying. Not only phrases and expressions and ideas, but whole sentences are repeated, until we are tempted to wonder whether the obligations of the prophet to Deuteronomy are not counterbalanced by his tendency to fall into the prolixity and verbosity of that book.

It would be a mistake, however, to conclude that there is nothing to brighten these writings.

In the darkness there comes at times a flash as of lightning, that reveals the whole land against the midnight sky with wondrous realism. Then again we hear voices speaking out of the darkness weirdly, and, while we see no man, we are thrilled by the words and feel the power of the born dramatist. Still further, when we look more closely we notice that there are even flowers to be gathered in this dark valley, and, stranger still, that he who walks within it has a playfulness of wit which could not be expected in the prophet of tragedy. Sometimes it is said that we cannot rightly judge regarding the characteristics of Jeremiah's style, as his writings have come from the hand of Baruch, and have been edited by later scribes. But the flowers and the wit are so apparent on almost every page that we are forced to conclude that they come from the prophet's own mind.

The figures of speech are apparent to the most cursory reader, but it is only when we study the book more closely that we observe how varied is the field from which they are drawn.

Some beautiful pictures of natural features of the land are painted by this artist: the swelling of the river Jordan, the snow that crowns the heights of Lebanon, the bubbling fountain still springing in the hot noontide when the cistern has yielded to the drought, the rushing of the black tempest across the sky. All these are open to the poet's eye. Then we hear echoes of the wild beasts: the cry of the jackals, the braying of the wild ass, and the roar of the lion that was still a terror to the lonely peasants of the land. The prophet has watched too the birds of the air: the stork that returns yearly at nesting time, the eagle with its wings widespread in flight, the swallows and the doves, and the owls and many another. Nor does Jeremiah disdain to notice the common things of everyday life: washing with soap, setting snares for birds, gathering grapes and pressing wine, labouring at the brick-kiln and building houses, shaping vessels at the potter's wheel, smelting copper and brass at the furnace. Common works like these yield many an illustration to the prophet's preaching.

It is true that these illustrations are only slightly developed and little dwelt upon, but it is possible that this compression may be due as much to the hand of Baruch as to the design of Jeremiah. In spoken word, the flowers may have grown more luxuriantly than we now find them, when embedded in the written word, for 'the flowers of Jeremiah's diction and thought have reached us only after being cut and pressed.'

It is scarcely possible to fully illustrate the playful wit of the prophet except by long quotations of the Hebrew text, as the wit consists chiefly in a playing upon words that can hardly be made effective in English. It would scarcely be becoming to call Jeremiah a punster, for he has nobler aims than we associate with that title, but, beyond any other Hebrew prophet, he indulges in a word-play that brightens and lightens many a gloomy passage.

The frequency of this form of wit may be judged by the fact that, within the first six chapters, there may be counted more than a dozen examples: 1¹⁰ 1^{11, 12} 1¹⁷ 2¹² 3¹⁹ 3²² 4^{17, 18} 4^{30, 31} 5²³ 6¹ 6¹¹ 6³⁰, and throughout the whole book there is the same peculiarity.

A few renderings may be attempted to give some faint idea of this word-play. The vision that Jeremiah saw when he was called by God is thus described: 'The word of the Lord came to me, saying, Jeremiah, what seest thou? And I said, I see a branch of a *saugh* tree (shaked). Then said the Lord unto me, Thou hast well seen: for I *saw* (shoked) my word to perform it.'

In the sixth chapter the prophet seeks to arouse the people to a sense of danger by descriptions of the siege, capture, and devastation of Jerusalem that were at hand, and his opening words may be freely rendered: 'O, ye children of Benjamin, flee for safety out of the midst of Jerusalem, and in "*Soundham*" (Tekoa), *sound* the trumpet, and in Beth-haccerem *fly* the *flag*.' Again, in the prophecy regarding Moab in the forty-eighth chapter, Jeremiah exclaims: 'The praise of Moab is no more. In *Plottown* (Heshbon) they have

plotted mischief against her: Come, and let us cut her off from being a nation. Thou also, O *Dumbton* (Madmen) shall be stricken *dumb*. The sword shall pursue thee.' Thus the prophet plays upon the names of well-known towns in a way that may be suggested by these English renderings, but cannot be truly translated.

One more passage may be quoted in which we find both the figurative and witty qualities of Jeremiah's style exemplified. At the close of the sixth chapter there is deep lamentation over the lamentable condition of the people of Zion. All had been done to reveal any excellence in them, and all had been done in vain. At last the prophet closes in sorrow with a figure taken from the work of the refining smith: 'The bellows glow; the lead is consumed of the fire. In vain hath the smelter smelted, and the wicked have not been separated. *Réfuse* shall men call them, for the Lord hath *refused* them.'

Many similar passages might be quoted; but this last quotation is enough to show that while Jeremiah's style may be sombre, it can also be glowing, and that in the midst of much that is monotonous there are surprising scintillations of wit.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

ACTS XIII. 2, 3.

'And as they ministered to the Lord, and fasted, the Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them. Then, when they had fasted and prayed and laid their hands on them, they sent them away' (R.V.).

EXPOSITION.

And as they ministered to the Lord—*i.e.* the prophets and teachers, at least primarily. It is probable that this ministry was that of prayer, and waiting upon God for special guidance on a matter already occupying their thought. This matter was surely the question of a forward movement into the Roman Empire, which we may imagine had been suggested by Saul, in pursuance of the special revelation, which he claims to have had touching the destination of the gospel for the Gentiles.—BARTLET.

And fasted.—Fasting would seem to have its basis in a grief over sin so deep and intense that all desire for food is taken away, or such a strong desire for holiness, for the

progress of God's work, for the removal of all that hinders it, that we forget to eat. Therefore it implies that we are doing that which fasting expresses. It is saying, I desire this good gift of God more than food, more than bodily pleasure, more than all else besides. So putting away every sin at any cost, taking up hardest duties, confession of sin to our neighbours, doing all we can for the love of Christ, are expressions of the same principle which underlies fasting.—PELOUBET.

The Holy Ghost said.—It is not stated by what means the Holy Spirit voiced His will, whether through prophets or through a general simultaneous impulse pervading the Church. We must be careful not to limit the ways in which the Holy Ghost speaks to us. He speaks to us by conscience, by reason, by providence, by His word and by inspiration.—PELOUBET.

Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them.—The 'work' was the conversion of the Gentiles. Hitherto Gentiles had indeed been admitted into the Church, but they had come in through the synagogue as God-fearing Greeks. Now St. Paul turns to

the Gentiles directly, and out of them builds up Catholic Churches, founded, that is, not on Jewish privilege but on the universal relation of man to God.—RACKHAM.

Then, when they had fasted and prayed and laid their hands on them.—The special selection by God the Holy Ghost did not dispense with ecclesiastical sanction to their mission.—COOK.

They sent them away.—Observe that this little Church gives, not money out of its treasury, but ministers, to the missionary cause; and that it surrenders to this cause its two most prominent pastors. Missionary work requires the best men the Church possesses.—ABBOTT.

THE SERMON.

The First Missionary Enterprise.

By the Rev. David Davies.

This is the record of the beginning of the first missionary enterprise in the Christian Church. For the first time the meaning of the Master's command, 'Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature,' was fully realized. God had educated these Christians gently, by a series of steps, till now they were prepared to go out on missionary pioneer work.

(1) The first step towards this end was the martyrdom of Stephen. Before his death the Church had remained contentedly in Jerusalem thinking that they did their duty if they clung together and merely existed. Then came the martyrdom and the subsequent persecution, and the bulk of the Christians were compelled to flee from Jerusalem.

(2) Philip went to Samaria, and there his Jewish prejudice against the hated Samaritans was modified, and he preached the gospel and was received gladly.

(3) Nor was this step final in the life of Philip. He was impelled by the Holy Spirit to go to Gaza by way of the desert. And in the desert he met the Ethiopian, and the gospel was preached to a man of a dark-skinned race.

(4) Peter went to Lydda and to Joppa, a part of the country where the people were mixed, descendants of Jews and Philistines, and there he learnt that nothing was common or unclean, and in the light of that vision he preached the gospel freely to Cornelius and his friends, who were Gentiles, without daring to limit its application to proselytes.

(5) We come now to the formation of a Christian Church at Antioch, under the co-pastorate of Paul and Barnabas. This Church at Antioch was freer

from Jewish prejudices than the Church at Jerusalem, and it was under the influence of Paul, and so it is not to be wondered at that it was from there and not from Jerusalem that the first missionaries were sent. Let us see what it was that made Paul and Barnabas and the others so enthusiastic and consequently so successful. The chief cause was their whole-hearted belief that their gospel was the only message that could satisfy the world's needs. Then, also, there was the assurance that beneath all differences there was a bond of universal brotherhood among men, and so men everywhere had a claim upon their service of love and goodwill. And, lastly, these first missionaries went forth because they were assured of the constant aid and protection of the Holy Spirit, at whose prompting they had given themselves to the work.

The Gift of the Spirit: an Ordination Sermon.

By Dean Church.

This is the account of the first Ordination in the Catholic Church, in which there was no longer 'Jew nor Gentile, bond nor free, but all were one in Christ Jesus.' It was no human agency that sent Barnabas and Saul forth on their eventful mission. It was God the Holy Ghost. And though forms and customs alter, and one language dies out and gives place to another, the central belief that it is God the Holy Ghost who gives the power and the authority to ordain ministers, and that from Him comes to each one in ordination the awful gift of His consecrating presence, to be prized and cherished or to be despised and rejected, never fails. This change of life from a layman to a clergyman must be the work of the Holy Ghost. From Him it must spring, and by Him it must be sustained. It is with Him that you will have to do your work; it is to Him that you will have to give your account. It is easy to forget that in all things you are the ministers of the unseen Christ. The claims of society blot it out; the worries and the weariness of the ordinary routine of work make us forget it. But behind all the turmoil the great truth remains.

(1) As a clergyman you will have to do with yourself. You have to know yourself, to be master over yourself, to govern and direct your purposes so as to suit yourself to your new calling. You have been singled out by the Holy Ghost for a

charge which all your brethren have not. He chooses you, not for higher honours than your brethren, but for more exacting service, for severer trials, in which your crown of victory may be brighter, but certainly your failure will be more disastrous.

(2) You have to do with others, and it is for others that you are chosen for your place and work, and remember that your only true relation to them is as the steward of the Holy Ghost. You must live in the consciousness that your office is a spiritual one, and that you are the servant of a Power whose mystery none can fathom and whose delight is the wills and characters of men brought back to His obedience. If you think of your calling as being not earthly but the work of the Holy Ghost, you will have a spring of comfort within your soul which even seeming failure cannot touch. Keep ever before you the remembrance of that awful and gracious Person with whom you have to work. Make it a definite subject of prayer that you may know Him more and more. Pray that He will give you warmth of soul, without which religion withers; and soberness and seriousness of judgment, without which truth is wrecked and reason lost.

ILLUSTRATIONS.

Separate me Barnabas and Saul.—Once when Dr. Duff was speaking he fainted in the midst of his speech. When he recovered he said, 'I was speaking for India, was I not?' and they replied that he was. 'Take me back that I may finish my speech.' Notwithstanding the entreaties of his friends, he insisted and went. Resuming, he then said, 'Is it true that we have been sending appeal after appeal for young men to go to India, and none of our sons have gone? Is it true, Mr. Moderator, that Scotland has no more sons to give to Christ? If true, although I have spent twenty-five years there, and lost my constitution, I will be off to-morrow, and go to the shores of the Ganges, and there be a witness for the Lord Jesus.'—J. ELLIS.

For the Work.—The war correspondent of the *Daily Express* (Mr. Percival Phillips) writes from Tokyo on April 20, 1904: 'The most wonderful patriotism in the history of the world has risen among the citizens of Japan. I can give you a striking instance of this which came under my notice the other day. It is the story of a woman who lived on the shores of Missipa Bay, below Yokohama. She was ill when the call to arms came, and her son was her only support. When the call to arms came the son did not answer. His mother questioned him closely, but he answered her evasively. He would go 'to-morrow' he said, but when the morrow came he was unready and full of

excuses. For three days he made excuses, and his mother expostulated with him. On the fourth day he was still at home. This time his mother did not protest, but that evening she committed suicide. In the note she left behind she explained that she had suddenly realized the cause of her son remaining at home when he should have been in the field. She knew that he had only remained with her because he was afraid she would starve if he left. The country demanded his services. She was an old woman and ill, she explained. Therefore her death would not matter, particularly as it saved her son's honour. The next day her son was in uniform.

A Volunteer Fever.—The correspondent continues: To fully realize the patriotism of the people you must know of the volunteer fever which has smitten old and young alike. At the War Office yesterday I was shown two great piles of letters in Japanese. 'These,' said the staff officer, 'are applications from men who want to fight. See,' and he pulled out one letter with characters in red, 'here is a communication from seven old men of Osaka. It is signed with their blood. They wish to form a battotai.' A battotai is an old term for a brigade of swordsmen, agile young men, who in feudal times rushed at the enemy with blades unsheathed, regardless of consequences. They were usually killed, but most of the enemy died with them. The seven old men complained that military regulations barred them from the regular army. Could they then be allowed to die gloriously for their emperor rather than live at home with hands folded?

They sent them away.—The Sea of Galilee receives the Jordan a small river and gives it out a great river, and this constant flow of water keeps the lake fresh and pure. The Dead Sea receives the Jordan a great river, but gives nothing out, and so its waters are rank, and in them nothing lives. Thus it was with the Church at Antioch. Its greatest source of strength was the missionaries it sent out.

Get leave to Work.

IN this world!—'tis the best you get at all!
For God in cursing, gives us better gifts
Than men in benediction. God says *sweat*
For foreheads—men say *crowns*—and so we are crowned,
Ay, gashed—by some tormenting circle of steel
Which snaps with a secret spring—Get work! get work!
Be sure 'tis better than what you work to get!

E. B. BROWNING.

FOR REFERENCE.

- Brooks (P.), *Candle of the Lord*, 163.
- Buckland and Mullins, *Missionary Speaker's Manual*, 62.
- Church (R. W.), *Pascal, and other Sermons*, 116.
- Dale (R. W.), *The Epistle of James*, 278.
- Davies (D.), *Talks with Men, Women, and Children*, vi. 46.
- Matheson (G.), *Voices of the Spirit*, 129.
- Rogers (J. G.), *Christ for the World*.
- Vallings (J. F.), *The Holy Spirit of Promise*, 87.
- Vaughan (C. J.), *Church of the First Days*, 132.

RECENT THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE.

BOOKS.

BOOKS INDEXED.

- ACTON (Lord, *as Projector*), The Cambridge Modern History. Vol. II. The Reformation.
- BERNARD (J. H., *as Editor*), Psalms of Israel.
- BRUCE (R., *as Editor*), Common Hope.
- CAIRD (E.), Evolution of Theology in the Greek Philosophers.
- CARR (A.), *Horæ Biblicæ*.
- CARROLL (J. S.), Exiles of Eternity.
- DAVIDSON (A. B.), Old Testament Prophecy.
- DAVIS (N. K.), The Story of the Nazarene.
- DICKIE (W.), Christian Ethics of Social Life.
- DONEHOO (J. de Q.), Apocryphal and Legendary Life of Christ.
- DRIVER (S. R.), Book of Genesis.
- DRUMMOND (J.), Character and Authorship of the Fourth Gospel.
- DRURY (T. W.), Confession and Absolution.
- FITZPATRICK (J.), Characteristics from Faber's Writings.
- FLEW (J.), Studies in Browning.
- HAIGH (H.), Some Leading Ideas of Hinduism.
- HARNACK (A.), What is Christianity? (3rd Edition).
- HASLETT (S. B.), Pedagogical Bible School.
- HERFORD (J. T.), Christianity in Talmud and Midrash.
- HOLTZMANN (O.), Life of Jesus.
- INGRAM (J. K.), Practical Morals.
- JÜLICHER (A.), Introduction to the New Testament.
- MUIRHEAD (L. A.), Eschatology of Jesus.
- PARRY (R. St. J.), Discussion of Ep. of St. James.
- PEABODY (F. G.), Religion of an Educated Man.
- PINCHES (T. G.), O.T. in Light of Historical Records of Assyria and Babylon.
- ROSS (D. M.), Teaching of Jesus.
- SETON (W. W., *as Editor*), Christian Apologetics.
- SHEPHEARD (H. B.), Parables of Man and of God.
- SNOWDEN (J. H.), Scenes and Sayings in the Life of Christ.
- STANTON (V. H.), Gospels as Historical Documents.
- STEPHEN (L.), An Agnostic's Apology (2nd Edition).
- STONE (D.), The Holy Communion.
- TODD (J. C.), Politics and Religion in Ancient Israel.
- WALLACE (A. R.), Man's Place in the Universe.
- WHYTE (A.), Bishop Butler, an Appreciation.
- WIMMER (R.), My Struggle for Light.

SUBJECTS.

- Abgar, DONEHOO 219 ff.
- Abraham, PINCHES 152-241.
- Absolution DRURY I.
- Acts, JÜLICHER 430-456.
- Adam in Apocrypha, DONEHOO (Index).
- Adolescence, INGRAM 34-68.
- „ Period, HASLETT 137-203.
- Agnosticism, SHEPHEARD 57-70.
- Agnostic's Apology, STEPHEN I-41.

- Agrapha, DONEHOO (Index).
- Akedia, CARROLL 133.
- Alchemy in Dante, CARROLL 404.
- Alogi, DRUMMOND 334.
- Angel of Jehovah, DRIVER 184.
- Angels in N.T. Apocr., DONEHOO (Index).
- Annunciation, DONEHOO 25.
- Apocalypses, Jewish, MUIRHEAD 57-95.
- Apocalyptic Literature of N.T., JÜLICHER 256-291.
- Apostolic Age, Religion, HARNACK 155 ff.
- Aristotle, Theology, CAIRD i. 260-382, ii. 1-30.
- Asceticism, HARNACK 81 ff.
- Ass, associated with Christ, HERFORD 154, 211.
- „ Worship, HERFORD 154.
- Assyria and Israel, PINCHES 327 ff.
- Astronomy, the New, WALLACE 24-46.
- Atonement in Christ's Death, HARNACK 159 ff.
- Attention, HASLETT 133 ff.
- Attrition, DRURY 103 ff.
- Auricular Confession, DRURY 14 ff.
- Avarice in Dante, CARROLL 110-125.
- Babel, Tower, DRIVER 136 f.
- Babylon and the Bible, PINCHES 525 ff.
- Babylonia and Israel, PINCHES 395 ff.
- Baptism, DRURY 81 ff.
- „ for the Dead, CARR 170-179.
- Barratry in Dante, CARROLL 306-329.
- Basilides and Fourth Gospel, DRUMMOND 296-331.
- Bath Qol, HERFORD 135, 184, 240.
- Belief, Newman's Theory, STEPHEN 168-241.
- Bible School, HASLETT I.
- „ for Education, HASLETT 306-340.
- Binding and Loosing, DRURY I ff., 146 ff.
- Browning, FLEW I.
- Cain and Abel, DRIVER 71 ff.
- Calvin and the Reformed Church, ACTON 342-376 (Fairbairn).
- Canon, N.T., JÜLICHER 459-566.
- Catechisms in Education, HASLETT 274-282.
- Catholic Epistles, JÜLICHER 201 ff.
- Catholicism, HARNACK 193 ff.
- Chance in the Bible, CARR 33-46.
- Cherubim, DRIVER 60 f.
- Childhood, INGRAM 14-33; HASLETT 100-136.
- „ and Manhood, WIMMER 61-90.
- Children and Church, BRUCE 113-140 (Boyle).
- „ Imagination, HASLETT 105 ff.
- „ Religion, HASLETT 131 ff.
- Christ and Balaam, TRAVERS 63-77.
- „ „ Founders of Religion, HOLTZMANN 521.
- „ „ Greek Philosophers, HOLTZMANN 514.
- „ Ascension, HERFORD 76, 271; DONEHOO 438-448; SNOWDEN 359-366.
- „ Baptism, HOLTZMANN 127-139; SNOWDEN 58-61.
- „ Birth, DONEHOO 48-62; SNOWDEN 23-28.
- „ Browning on, FLEW 9-38.
- „ Burial, DONEHOO 363-374.

- Christ, Childhood, DONEHOO 109 ff.; SNOWDEN 37-43.
 „ Crucifixion, HERFORD 83; DONEHOO 348-362.
 „ Disciples, HERFORD 90.
 „ Eschatology, MUIRHEAD I.
 „ Galilean Ministry, DAVIS 133-218.
 „ Grandparents, DONEHOO I-II.
 „ History, HARNACK 33 ff.
 „ Incarnation, DAVIS 27-36.
 „ in Talmud and Midrash, TRAVERS 35-96.
 „ Judæan Ministry, DAVIS 105-132, 239-264.
 „ Life, HOLTZMANN I.
 „ „ Apocryphal, DONEHOO I.
 „ „ and Chronology, DAVIS 417-426.
 „ „ Sources, HOLTZMANN 7-61.
 „ „ Turning Points, HOLTZMANN 62-80.
 „ Message, HARNACK 50 ff.
 „ „ to Scholars, PEABODY 31-60.
 „ Miracles, DONEHOO 207 ff.
 „ Passion, DAVIS 327-388.
 „ Perean Ministry, DAVIS 265-288.
 „ Preparation, DAVIS 55-104.
 „ Resurrection, HOLTZMANN 492-529; DONEHOO 396-409; HARNACK 163 ff.; DAVIS 388-416.
 „ Resurrection, Evidence for, SETON 115-124 (Wilson).
 „ Return, HARNACK 170 ff.
 „ Revelation and Example, CARR 157-169.
 „ Teaching, DONEHOO 242 ff.; HARNACK 37 ff.; ROSS I.
 „ „ about Himself, ROSS 162-166.
 „ „ Attitude to O.T., ROSS 168-176.
 „ „ Form, ROSS 46-59.
 „ „ Moral Ideals, ROSS 100-123.
 „ „ on Fatherhood, ROSS 68-80.
 „ „ „ Filial Tempers, ROSS 82-88.
 „ „ „ Kingdom of God, ROSS 124-146.
 „ „ „ Origin, ROSS 60-66.
 „ „ „ Outlook on Future, ROSS 178-197.
 „ „ „ Sources of Information, ROSS 26-45.
 „ „ „ Worth, of Man, ROSS 90-98.
 „ „ Temptation, HOLTZMANN 140-154; SNOWDEN 62-68.
 „ „ Testimony to Himself, HARNACK 127 ff.
 „ „ Transfiguration, SNOWDEN 195-201.
 „ „ Trial, HERFORD 78.
 Christianity and Greek Philosophy, CAIRD II. 347-372.
 „ „ in Talmud and Midrash, HERFORD I.
 „ „ Judaistic, CARR 203-218.
 Christian and Humanity, DICKIE 267-277.
 „ „ Evidences, Nature and Scope, SETON XIII.-XXII. (M'Laren).
 „ „ Name, CARR 47-57.
 Christology, HARNACK 127 ff.
 Church and Children, BRUCE 113-140 (Boyle).
 „ „ Individual, DICKIE 117-123.
 „ „ Society, DICKIE 127-135.
 „ „ State, DICKIE 139-147.
 „ „ Temperance, BRUCE 87-112 (Freeman).
 „ „ Army Methods, BRUCE 185-190 (Davey).
 „ „ Nature and Functions, DICKIE 103-113.
 „ „ Testimony, BRUCE 3-44 (Whateley).
 Circumcision, DRIVER 189 ff.
 Cities of the Plain, DRIVER 168 ff., 202 f.
 City-state, TODD 15 ff., 182 ff.
 Civilization, HARNACK 120 ff.
 Clan-god, TODD 36 ff.
 Clement (Ep.) and Ep. of James, PARRY 73.
 Cocytus in Dante, CARROLL 420-480.
 Colossians (Ep.), JÜLICHER, 127 ff.
 Commemoration, INGRAM 146-148.
 Confession, DRURY I.
 Contrition, DRURY 103 ff.
 Convictions, BRUCE 45-60 (Magee).
 Corinthians (Epistles), JÜLICHER 78-102.
 Cosmogony of Genesis, DRIVER 19-33.
 Creation, PINCHES I-68.
 Criticism and Pastoral Work, WIMMER 114-160.
 Culpa et Poena, DRURY 182 ff.
 Cyrus the Lord's Anointed, CARR I-27.
 Dante's Conversion, CARROLL 481-493.
 „ „ Inferno, CARROLL I.
 „ „ Life, CARROLL I.-lxi.
 „ „ Mysticism, CARROLL xvii.
 Darwinism, SETON I-24 (Henslow).
 Dead Sea and Vale of Siddim, DRIVER 168 ff.
 Death, INGRAM 138-145.
 „ „ Browning on, FLEW 205-220.
 Decalogue, TODD 188 ff.
 Deluge, Historical Character, DRIVER 99 ff.
 Demons in Dante, CARROLL 272, 308, 455.
 Deportation, TODD 116 f.
 Docetæ, DRUMMOND 343.
 Dreams and Realities, STEPHEN 86-126.
 Eden, PINCHES 69.
 Education, Religion as, PEABODY I-29.
 Egypt, Famines, DRIVER 347.
 „ „ Land Tenure, DRIVER 374.
 Enoch, DRIVER 78 f.
 Environment, DICKIE 151-157.
 „ „ Christ's Indifference, DICKIE 161-167.
 Ephesians (Ep.), JÜLICHER, 127 ff.
 Eschatology of Jesus, MUIRHEAD I.
 Ethical (Pagan) Words in N.T., CARR 126-141.
 Ethics, Stoic, CAIRD II. 130-161.
 Eucharist, STONE I.
 „ „ and Human Life, STONE I-9.
 „ „ in Theology and Life, STONE 280.
 „ „ Matter, STONE 201-221.
 „ „ Mediæval Doctrine, STONE 71-116.
 „ „ Mixed Chalice, STONE 207.
 „ „ Necessity, STONE 188.
 „ „ Patristic Doctrine, STONE 36-70.
 „ „ Post-Reformation Doctrine, STONE 181-187.
 „ „ Reformation Doctrine, STONE 117-180.
 „ „ Reservation, STONE 250.
 „ „ Scripture Doctrine, STONE 10-35.
 „ „ Titles, STONE 278.
 „ „ Vestments, STONE 271.
 Exodus, PINCHES 268-309.
 Experience, Witness of, SETON 77-99 (Welsh).
 Eye-witness of John's Gospel, DRUMMOND 375, 386.
 Faith, Browning on, FLEW 99-112.
 „ „ in Ep. of James, PARRY 43-52.
 Family as School of Morals, DICKIE 75-85.
 „ „ Religious Significance, DICKIE 61-71.

- Family, Social Significance, DICKIE 49-57.
 Flood, PINCHES 85-117.
 Food, Burning, HERFORD 57, 187.
 Fraud in Dante's Inferno, CARROLL 251-419.
 Galatians (Ep.), JÜLICHER 68-78.
 Gehazi in Talmud, HERFORD 97.
 Genesis, DRIVER I ; SETON 27-41 (Wace).
 „ Chronology, DRIVER xxi, xxv ff.
 „ Cosmogony, DRIVER 19-33.
 „ Historical Value, DRIVER xxxi ff.
 „ Religious Value, DRIVER lxi ff.
 Glory, PARRY 36.
 Gluttony in Dante's Inferno, CARROLL 100-109.
 Gnosticism, CAIRD ii. 317-346.
 God and Nature, WIMMER 22-60.
 „ Browning on, FLEW 1-8.
 „ Fatherhood, HARNACK 65 ff.
 „ Names in Genesis, DRIVER 402-410.
 „ Platonic Idea, CAIRD 198-220.
 „ Unity in Talmud and Midrash, HERFORD 291.
 Good Platonic Idea, CAIRD i. 140-172.
 „ Stoic Idea, CAIRD ii. 103-129.
 Gospel, HARNACK 10 ff.
 „ and Doctrine, HARNACK 149 ff.
 „ „ Law, HARNACK 105 ff.
 „ „ the Poor, HARNACK 90 ff.
 „ „ Work, HARNACK 120 ff.
 „ „ the World, HARNACK 81 ff.
 Gospels, JÜLICHER 292 ff.
 „ as Historical Documents, STANTON I.
 „ Apocryphal, DONEHOO I.
 „ Lost, DONEHOO ii ff.
 „ Synoptic, JÜLICHER 296-383.
 Greek and Christian Theology, CAIRD ii. 347-372.
 „ Philosophy and Theology, CAIRD i. ii.
 Habsburg and Valois, ACTON 36-103 (Leathes).
 Hammurabi's Code, PINCHES 487 ff.
 Hebrews (Ep.), JÜLICHER, 148-174.
 Henry VIII., ACTON 416-473 (Gairdner).
 Heredity, DICKIE 171-181.
 Hittites in Hebron, DRIVER 228 ff.
 Holiness in Israel, TODD 41 ff.
 Holy Spirit, HARNACK 168 ff.
 Home, Making, DICKIE 89-99.
 Hope, Browning on, FLEW 113-128.
 Human Sacrifice, TODD 43 ff.
 Hypocrisy in Dante's Inferno, CARROLL 330-341.
 Idealism, SHEPHEARD 71-92.
 „ East and West, HAIGH 93-118.
 „ Platonic, CAIRD i. 80-259.
 Illusion (Mâyâ), HAIGH 76-92.
 Immortality of the Soul, Browning on, FLEW 221-238.
 „ „ „ „ Platonic, CAIRD i. 198-220.
 „ „ „ „ Talmud, HERFORD 315.
 Imperialism, New, BRUCE 61-86 (House).
 Individualism, Stoic, CAIRD ii. 79-102.
 Infant Communion, STONE 190-200.
 Inspiration of the Prophets, DAVIDSON 144-158.
 Isaac, PINCHES 242.
 „ Sacrifice, DRIVER 221 f.
 Isaiah, Deutero-, DAVIDSON 377-407.
 Isaiah, Problem, DAVIDSON 242-272.
 Ishmaelites, DRIVER 243 f.
 Israel, Religion and Politics, TODD I.
 Jacob, PINCHES 242.
 „ at Penuel, DRIVER 296 f.
 „ „ Shechem, DRIVER 306 ff.
 James (Ep.), JÜLICHER, 215-229 ; PARRY I.
 John, Asiatic Tradition, STANTON 162-243.
 „ Epistles, JÜLICHER 241-255.
 „ the Baptist, HOLTZMANN 108-126 ; HARNACK 39 ff.
 „ „ „ Preaching, CARR 69-73.
 „ „ „ Presbyter, DRUMMOND, 194-254.
 John's Gospel, JÜLICHER 383-429.
 „ „ and 1 John, DRUMMOND 163-179.
 „ „ „ Synoptics, DRUMMOND 7-20.
 „ „ „ Authenticity, DRUMMOND 39-66.
 „ „ „ Authorship, DRUMMOND I.
 „ „ „ Character, DRUMMOND I.
 „ „ „ Historicity, DRUMMOND, 28-66.
 „ „ „ Purpose, DRUMMOND 21-27.
 Joseph, PINCHES 242.
 „ Character, DRIVER 400 f.
 „ Date, DRIVER 347.
 Jude (Ep.), JÜLICHER 229-232.
 Justin Martyr and the Gospels, STANTON 76-136.
 „ „ on Fourth Gospel, DRUMMOND 84-162.
 Keys, DRURY I.
 Kinah, TODD 10, 69, 130, 259.
 Kingdom of God, HOLTZMANN 155-180 ; HARNACK 54 ff.
 Knowledge and Service, PEABODY 63-89.
 „ Religion as, PEABODY 1-29.
 Laban, DRIVER 290.
 Language, Influence of Christianity, CARR 142-156.
 Life, Adjusting Perspective, DICKIE 11-22.
 „ Atmosphere in Relation to, WALLACE 243-261.
 „ Browning on, FLEW 167-182.
 „ Earth in Relation to, WALLACE 218-242.
 „ Physical Conditions, WALLACE, 206-217.
 „ Setting Value on, DICKIE 3-10.
 Lot, DRIVER 205.
 Love, Browning on, FLEW 129-152.
 „ Law, HARNACK 72 ff.
 „ the Word in N.T., CARR 142-153.
 Luke, Gospel, JÜLICHER 329-338.
 Luther, ACTON 104-141 (Lindsay).
 Luxury, DICKIE 255-263.
 Machpelah, DRIVER 228.
 Man, Browning on, FLEW 39-58.
 „ Neo-Platonic Ideas, CAIRD 289-316.
 Manhood, INGRAM 69-99.
 Mannerisms, Clerical, BRUCE 141-154 (Blunt).
 Marcion and Fourth Gospel, DRUMMOND 286-295.
 Mark's Gospel, JÜLICHER 317-329.
 Marriage, INGRAM 100-110.
 Mary (Virgin), Birth and Childhood, DONEHOO 12.
 „ „ Betrothal, DONEHOO 25.
 „ „ in Talmud, HERFORD 35 ff.
 „ „ Virginity, DONEHOO 38.
 Materialism, STEPHEN 127-167.
 „ or Christianity, SETON 101-113 (Manley).
 Matthew's Gospel, JÜLICHER 301-317.

- Matthias' Election, CARR 101-115.
 Maturity, INGRAM 111-131.
 Medicean Rome, ACTON 1-35 (Kraus).
 Melchizedek, DRIVER 167 f.
 „ Priesthood in Talmud, HERFORD 338.
 Messiah, Jesus as, HARNACK 133 ff.
 Midrash, Christianity in, HERFORD 1.
 Minim, HERFORD 97-400.
 Ministry, Joy, BRUCE 191-207 (Bruce).
 Miracles in Gospels, HARNACK 26 ff.
 „ of later Judaism, HERFORD 112.
 Misers in Dante's Inferno, CARROLL 110-125.
 Missions, DICKIE 295-307.
 Morality and Religion, WIMMER 1-21.
 Morals, Practical, INGRAM 1.
 Naaseni, DRUMMOND 332.
 Neo-Platonism, CAIRD ii. 162-372.
 Newman's Theory of Belief, STEPHEN 168-241.
 New Testament, Introduction, JÜLICHER 1.
 Nimrod and Babylon, DRIVER 122 f.
 Notzri, Notzrim, HERFORD 344.
 Pantheism, Hindu, HAIGH 47-139.
 „ Stoic, CAIRD ii. 79-102.
 Papias and the Presbyter John, DRUMMOND 194-254.
 Parables of Man and God, SHEPHEARD 1.
 Paradise, Site, DRIVER 57-60.
 Paschal Controversy, DRUMMOND 444-513.
 Pastoral Epistles, JÜLICHER 174-200.
 Patriarchs (Antediluvian), DRIVER 79 f.
 Paul, HARNACK 179 ff.
 „ and Greek Philosophy, CARR 116-125.
 „ Writings, JÜLICHER 32 ff.
 Penance, DRURY 51 ff., 229 ff.
 Perata, DRUMMOND 332.
 Peter, 1st Ep., JÜLICHER 204-215.
 „ 1st Ep. and Ep. of James, PARRY 69-72.
 „ 2nd Ep., JÜLICHER 232-241.
 Philemon (Ep.), JÜLICHER 125-127.
 Philipians (Ep.), JÜLICHER 118-125.
 Philo, CAIRD ii. 184-209.
 Philosophy and Religion, SHEPHEARD 57-116.
 Pilate, DONEHOO 462 ff.
 Planets, Are they Habitable? WALLACE 1.
 Plato and Aristotle, CAIRD i. 260-285.
 „ Idealism, CAIRD i. 80-259.
 „ Precursors, CAIRD i. 58-79.
 Plotinus, CAIRD ii. 210-257.
 Polycarp and Fourth Gospel, DRUMMOND, 180-193.
 Poverty, DICKIE 213-223.
 „ Charity to, DICKIE 227-239.
 Prayer-Book Teaching on Confession, DRURY 1.
 Preaching, BRUCE 155-172 (Ferrar).
 Prodigality in Dante, CARROLL 113.
 Prophecy in History of Israel, DAVIDSON 16-29.
 „ „ Human History, DAVIDSON 1-15.
 „ „ Israel, TODD 49, 90, 109, 139.
 „ „ Time of David, DAVIDSON 50-61.
 „ „ „ Deborah, DAVIDSON, 30-39.
 „ „ „ Samuel and Saul, DAVIDSON 40-49.
 „ „ „ Messianic, DAVIDSON 309-376.
 „ „ „ Natural Symbolism in, DAVIDSON 193-209.
 Prophecy Source, DAVIDSON 144-158.
 Prophetic State, DAVIDSON 115-143.
 „ „ Style, DAVIDSON 159-192.
 Prophets, Canonical Classified, DAVIDSON 273-284.
 „ „ False, DAVIDSON 285-308.
 „ „ Names and Definition, DAVIDSON 75-93.
 „ „ Position in State, DAVIDSON 94-114.
 Protestantism, HARNACK 272 ff.
 Psalms, Eschatology, BERNARD 43-66 (Pooler).
 „ „ Future Life in, BERNARD 67-84 (White).
 „ „ Growth, BERNARD 25-42 (Kennedy).
 „ „ Imprecatory, BERNARD 105-120 (Chadwick).
 „ „ in Christian History, BERNARD 170-188 (Bernard).
 „ „ „ Public Worship, BERNARD 139-169 (Lawlor).
 „ „ „ Temple Worship, BERNARD 1-24 (Lawlor).
 „ „ „ Messianic, BERNARD 85-104 (White).
 „ „ „ Penitential, BERNARD 121-138 (Bernard).
 Puberty and Education, HASLETT 142-157.
 Quotation, Ancient Habits, STANTON 25-28.
 Rationalism of To-day, SETON 1-24 (Henslow).
 Reason, Aristotelian, CAIRD i. 286-382.
 Reformation among Catholics, ACTON 639-689 (Laurence).
 „ „ and Philosophy, ACTON 690-718 (Fairbairn).
 „ „ in France, ACTON 280-304 (Tilley).
 „ „ „ Germany, ACTON 142-279 (Pollard).
 „ „ „ Poland, ACTON 634-638 (Leathes).
 „ „ „ Scandinavia, ACTON 599-633 (Collins).
 „ „ „ Scotland, ACTON 550-598 (Maitland).
 „ „ „ South Europe, ACTON 377-415 (Collins).
 „ „ „ Switzerland, ACTON 305-341 (Whitney).
 „ „ „ under Edward VI., ACTON 474-511 (Pollard).
 „ „ „ Henry VIII., ACTON 416-473 (Gairdner).
 „ „ „ Philip and Mary, ACTON 512-549 (Müllinger).
 Religion as Education, PEABODY 1-29.
 „ „ and Theology, CAIRD i. 1-30.
 „ „ of all Sensible Men, STEPHEN 325-367.
 Repentance, DRURY 63 ff.
 Resurrection in Talmud, HERFORD 232.
 Retirement, INGRAM 132-137.
 Righteousness, Higher, HARNACK 72 ff.
 „ „ Word in N.T., CARR 142-156.
 Romans (Ep.), JÜLICHER 102-118.
 „ „ (Ep.) and Ep. of James, PARRY 53-68.
 Rome (Ch.) in Germany, ACTON 142-279 (Pollard).
 Sabbath, DRIVER 34 f.
 Sacraments, Number, DRURY 81 ff.
 Satisfaction, DRURY 181 ff.
 Scepticism of Believers, STEPHEN 42-85.
 Schisin in Dante, CARROLL 382-401.
 Science and Religion, SHEPHEARD 9-56.
 Sects in Christianity, WIMMER 161-216.
 Self-Culture by Self-Realisation, DICKIE 25-33.
 Sensuality in Dante, CARROLL 97, 271.
 Serpent-Worship in Israel, TODD 88, 170.
 Servant of the Lord, DAVIDSON 408-467.
 Shiloh, DRIVER 410 ff.
 Simony in Dante, CARROLL 276-291.
 Sins in Dante, CARROLL lxii. 171 ff.
 Social Sainthood, DICKIE 37-45.
 „ „ Question, HARNACK 90 ff.

- Son of Man, MUIRHEAD 145-207.
 Soul, Browning on, FLEW 79-98.
 Stars, Are they Infinite? WALLACE 135-155.
 „ Distances, WALLACE 73-98.
 „ Distribution, WALLACE 47-72.
 „ Have they Planets, WALLACE 282-294.
 Star-Worship in Israel, TODD 168.
 State, Platonic, CAIRD i. 140-172.
 Stoicism, CAIRD ii. 55-161.
 Stone-Worship, DRIVER 267.
 Stumbling-block, CARR 58-68.
 Suicide in Dante, CARROLL 211 ff.
 Sullenness in Dante, CARROLL 127 ff.
 Sunday, BRUCE 173-184 (Wilton).
 Sunday School, HASLETT I.
 „ „ History, HASLETT 17-84.
 Synoptic Gospels as Witnesses, SETON 47-71 (Margoliouth).
 Synoptic Problem, JÜLICHER 338-367.
 Talmud, Christianity in, HERFORD I.
 Tel el-Amarna Tablets, PINCHES 268.
 Temperance and the Church, BRUCE 87-112 (Freeman).
 Temptation, PARRY 32.
 Text of N.T., JÜLICHER 567-629.
 Theology and Religion, CAIRD i. 1-30.
 „ Development, CAIRD i. 31-57.
 „ in Greek Philosophy, CAIRD i. ii.
 Thessalonians, Epistles, JÜLICHER 54-68.
 Time and Eternity, WIMMER 90-113.
 Toleration, STEPHEN 242-324.
 Transmigration in India, HAIGH 11-46.
 Truth, Browning on, FLEW 153-166.
 Typology in Nature and Revelation, DAVIDSON 210-223.
 „ „ Scripture, DAVIDSON 224-241.
 Ur and the Hebrews, DRIVER 142.
 Usury in Dante, CARROLL 176 ff.
 Valentinians and Fourth Gospel, DRUMMOND 265-285.
 Vedantism as a Religion, HAIGH 119-137.
 War, Ethical Aspect, DICKIE 281-291.
 Wealth, Duties and Dangers, DICKIE 243-251.
 Work, Browning on, FLEW 183-204.
 „ Ethical Aspects, DICKIE 197-209.
 World-Soul, CAIRD ii. 258-288.

St. Paul's Infirmary.

BY THE REV. WM. MENZIES ALEXANDER, M.A., B.Sc., B.D., C.M., M.D., GLASGOW,
 PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY OF THE FREE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.

THE following is a new and independent investigation of a well-worn theme. The nature of the apostle's illness was no secret to the Galatians, Corinthians, and others in his day. But his reticence on the subject has baffled the inquiries of later ages. Our information is meagre and couched in obscure language. Competent scholars have made the most of it, and their labours have been supplemented by the results of travel. Yet the enigma remains. Ingenious theories have been often evolved from what is little more than a single phrase or symptom. It is still customary to speak of Paul's 'infirmary' as if it were co-extensive with the conventional 'thorn in the flesh.' No opinion will be satisfactory which fails to take account of the whole evidence available. That has not been by any means exhausted. There are still hints and suggestions which may be turned to good account. There remains also one of the most promising fields of research really unexplored. We refer to the diseases, endemic and epidemic, prevalent in the regions traversed by Paul. When these and other points are scrutinized, the problem assumes an aspect altogether new. It may not attain finality,

but it approaches thereto. The treatment of the subject must be in part retrospective. Previous opinions must be considered and their merits tested. The fundamental facts are those furnished by the apostle himself in the two classical passages: 'That I should not be exalted over much, there was given to me a σκόλοψ for the flesh, an angel of Satan to buffet me, that I should not be exalted overmuch. Concerning this thing I besought the Lord thrice, that it might depart from me. And He has said unto me, My grace is sufficient for thee: for power is perfected in weakness. Most gladly therefore will I rather glory in my infirmities, that the power of Christ may overshadow me' (2 Co 12⁷⁻⁹); 'Ye know that because of an infirmity of the flesh I preached the gospel unto you the first time: and that which was a trial to you in my flesh ye despised not, nor rejected; but ye received me as an angel of God, even as Christ Jesus. Where then is that gratulation of yourselves? For I bear you witness, that, if possible, ye would have plucked out your eyes and given them to me' (Gal 4¹³⁻¹⁵).

These two passages have generally been taken as referring to one and the same 'infirmary.'

Lightfoot remarks that they 'so closely resemble each other, that it is not unnatural to suppose the allusion to be the same in both.' In the last analysis, this opinion will be found to justify itself; but at present there is in fact no exegetical bond betwixt them. The two descriptions differ in detail; but they will ultimately be found to refer to different stages or aspects of one disease. The traditional modes of interpreting the apostle's 'infirmity' must be briefly glanced at.

1. *External Persecutions*.—So thought Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, and others. To this opinion there are many objections, one of which at least is invincible. The first incidence of this 'infirmity' precedes the writing of the Second Epistle to the Corinthians by some fourteen years. But some ten years intervened between that event and the conversion of Paul; and these years had their own tale of persecution.

2. *Spiritual Trials*.—So thought Gerson, Luther, Calvin, and others. The list of these trials is tintured by the fancy or experience of individual authors. Among the items in this catalogue are suggestions of Satan, blasphemous thoughts, stings of conscience, failure in duty, proneness to despair, and similar defects. Such weaknesses could not have been an occasion of glory, but rather of shame, to the subject of them.

3. *Carnal Thoughts*.—So thought Gregory the Great, Aquinas, Bellarmine, and others. The Vulgate translates the σκόλοψ τῇ σαρκὶ by *stimulus carnis*, and the suggestion was welcome to the vexed ascetic mood. This view has been rightly repelled as 'an outrage on the great apostle.' Paul claimed for himself the *charisma* of continence, and the lofty spiritual tenor of his life amply justifies his claim in this respect.

4. *Bodily Disease*.—That is the only version which gives due weight to the fact that the 'infirmity' was in the flesh, and therefore something inseparable from the body of the apostle. It is not possible to assign off-hand an exact meaning to σκόλοψ. Etymologically, it might signify either a thorn or a stake. The former is more frequent in the Septuagint; the latter in classical writers. But the context is itself decisive. The mediating term between the thorn and the stake is the buffeting of an angel of Satan, or angel of punishment (cf. Book of Enoch, 56¹). That buffeting is metaphorically the measure of the pain inflicted by the σκόλοψ. A thorn is

clearly too weak a rendering; for a thorn may be removed with ease, or may remain without discomfort. But the buffeting of an angel of Satan has for its counterpart the agony of impalement. For Paul, therefore, the σκόλοψ was no trifling prickle, but a ghastly stake.

From the first of the preceding passages we learn that the features of the apostle's 'infirmity' were the following:—

- (a) Agonizing bodily pain.
- (b) Corresponding mental depression.
- (c) Certain residual effects of this illness.

From the second of the preceding passages we learn that the features of the apostle's 'infirmity' were the following:—

- (a) It was a trial to the Galatians.
- (b) It was provocative of contempt and loathing.
- (c) It was something crippling or repulsive, or both.

These passages, either singly or in combination, must be held to exclude such loose imaginations as are conveyed in the suggestions of mere baldness or earache or hæmorrhoids or *animalcula capitis*. Findlay mentions 'some obscure form of hysteria.' That is an unfortunate conjecture. As a matter of fact, hysterical men are rare, and hysterical heroes are chimerical! Other theories are acute ophthalmia, epilepsy, malarial fever, headache, insanity, and melancholy. Some of these are at least plausible, and none of them without a claim to attention.

1. *Acute Ophthalmia*.—This view has been favoured by Howson, Lewin, Farrar, Plumptre, and many others. The general argument in support of it is cumulative. Thus the trouble is traced to the 'light from heaven, above the brightness of the sun,' that shone round Paul on the way to Damascus. That excess of light is believed to have left his eyes weak and inflamed; a condition aggravated by the sojourn in Arabia. Weakness of the eyes is also discovered in the use of the 'large letters' to the Galatians (Gal 6¹¹), and in the employment of an amanuensis (2 Th 3¹⁷ etc.). Positive evidence of defective eyesight is found in Paul 'earnestly beholding' (ἀτενίζειν) the council, and in his failure to recognize the high priest at his trial, though he must have seen him a few days previously. It is further pointed out that acute ophthalmia suits the pain implied in the σκόλοψ, and the deformity contained in the loathing (ἐξουθενεῖν).

But this view cannot be accepted. It assumes a twofold cause for the 'infirmity.' On the one hand, it is ascribed to 'the light from heaven'; on the other, to the buffeting of 'an angel of Satan.' But what fellowship have these with each other? This theory is based on a misconception to begin with. The blindness of the apostle was really temporary, and was completely cured. That is stated in the use of the verb ἀναβλέπειν, which is used twice in this connexion (Ac 9¹⁸ 22¹⁸). It is the regular term for denoting perfect recovery from blindness, whether that be congenital or acquired (Jn 9¹¹, Mk 8²⁵). Further, the term ἀπειλίζειν is so far from denoting feeble sight, that it is constantly applied to keenness or clearness of vision. It occurs in the following under various disguises—

'The eyes of all *were fastened* on Jesus' (Lk 4²⁰).

'A certain maid *earnestly looked* on Peter' (Lk 22⁵⁶).

'They *looked steadfastly* toward heaven' (Ac 1¹⁰).

'Peter *fastened his eyes* on the lame man' (Ac 3⁴).

'They said, Why *look* ye so *earnestly* on us?' (Ac 3¹²).

'The council *looked earnestly* on Stephen' (Ac 6¹⁵).

'Stephen *looked up steadfastly* into heaven' (Ac 7⁵⁵).

'Cornelius *looked* on the angel' (Ac 10⁴).

'Peter *fastened his eyes* on the sheet' (Ac 11⁶).

'Paul *set his eyes* on Elymas (Etoimas)' (Ac 13⁹).

'Paul *steadfastly beheld* the cripple' (Ac 14⁹).

'Paul *earnestly beheld* the council' (Ac 23¹).

'Israel could not *steadfastly behold* the face of Moses' (2 Co 3⁷).

'Moses veiled his face that Israel might not *steadfastly look*' (2 Co 3¹⁸).

Acute ophthalmia is thus a baseless conjecture, opposed to the statements of Scripture. The 'large letters' and the use of an amanuensis are easily explained without the help of this hypothesis. The mistake about the high priest was not unnatural, seeing that he wore no distinctive dress, except when on duty in the temple. The reference to the Galatians as ready to 'dig out' their eyes is in essence proverbial (Ps 17⁸, Pr 7², etc.). It recalls an impulsive enthusiasm which spurned conventional restraints. It was no weak-eyed adventurer who frightened

Elymas out of his wits, nor a blear-eyed pretender who called for the 'books but especially the parchments' from Troas (2 Ti 4¹⁸). On many grounds the theory of acute ophthalmia must be discarded as untenable.

2. *Epilepsy*.—This view is associated with the names of Holsten, Ewald, Hausrath, v. Hofmann, Klöpper, Lightfoot, Schaff, Schmiedel, Krenkel, and others. Its acceptance may seem to some to be fraught with danger to dogmatic interests. That fear may be instantly dismissed. Epilepsy is not of necessity incompatible with a vigorous intellectual life. Among distinguished epileptics may be named Julius Caesar, Mohammed, King Alfred, Savonarola, Peter the Great, and Napoleon 1. It is clear that Paul was of a nervous temperament, but from that fact alone no inference of epilepsy is permissible. Strauss is not to be followed here. Farrar would even attach the hypothesis of epilepsy to that of acute ophthalmia, because connected with the cerebral disturbances in severe cases. That conclusion requires the support of analogous cases, but these are not forthcoming. It finds no corroboration whatever from the narrative of Paul's career. It would make him a prodigy, unmatched even by the much-enduring and crafty Ulysses. As good as blind and a confirmed epileptic! Yet he weathers every storm!

Lightfoot takes the case of King Alfred as a close parallel to that of Paul. This ruler in his youth is said to have suffered from some kind of eruption which caused him such torture that he began to despair of life. He feared that his bodily infirmities, or perhaps leprosy or blindness, might render him incapable of exercising the royal power or despicable in the sight of the world. From such a plague he prayed to be delivered, and all signs of his malady disappeared not long afterwards. But at the very moment that he had taken to himself a wife, in the midst of the marriage festivities, the evil against which he had prayed overtook him. 'He was suddenly seized with fear and trembling; and to the very hour that Asser wrote, to a good old age, he was never sure of not being attacked by it. There were instants when this visitation seemed to render him incapable of any exertion, either intellectual or bodily; but the repose of a day, a night, or even an hour would always raise his courage again.'

Asser's confused account shows that the youth of Alfred was marred by a complication of disorders, and his manhood by a form of epilepsy (*petit mal*). Lightfoot singles out certain features in the preceding description as analogous to the case of Paul. These are the despair of life, the fear of blindness or becoming contemptible, the prayer for deliverance, the sudden seizure with fear and trembling, the liability to recurrences, and the consequent prostration. The diagnosis of epilepsy must here rest on these three last symptoms. But while fear and trembling, repeated attacks, and temporary incapacity are mentioned likewise in the connexion with the apostle's 'infirmity,' the sequel shows that these must bear quite another meaning and belong to a wholly different disease. No real analogy exists between the two cases. The attempted comparison is indeed vitiated by the arbitrary selection of special symptoms.

Krenkel has sought a new basis for the theory of epilepsy in the peculiar remark of Paul concerning his 'infirmity': 'Ye did not set it at naught, nor did ye spit it out' (οὐκ ἐξουθενήσατε οὐδὲ ἐξεπτύσατε, Gal 4¹⁴). This at first sight seems to press the latter term unduly; but it is always found in its literal sense of spitting out. Krenkel therefore emphasizes the fact that persons witnessing an epileptic seizure were accustomed to spit out. But more precisely we note that Plautus regards the epileptic himself as the object of the spitting: 'Et illic isti qui inputatur morbus interdum venit. Et eum morbum mi esse ut qui me opus inputarier. Ne verere, multos iste morbus homines macerat, quibus inputari saluti fuit' (Cap. III. iv. 18, 19, 22, 23). Pliny explains the Roman antipathy to the eating of quails by alleging the liability of these birds to epilepsy: 'Comitalem propter morbum despui suetum' (H.N. x. 23). But he knew of many occasions for the superstitious practice of spitting; epilepsy being the chief: 'Despuimus comitiales morbos, hoc est, contagia regerimus' (H.N. xxviii. 7). Fascinations were thus repelled, and portents attendant upon meeting a person lame in the right foot. Those who indulged extravagant hopes appeased the gods by spitting into their lap. Those taking medicine, thrice spat on the ground and thrice conjured their malady by way of aiding the action of the remedy. On the entrance of a stranger, or on a person looking at an infant asleep, the nurse

thrice spat on the ground. Pliny's additional examples, some amusing and others unsavoury, need not be quoted. It is evident that, *if the Galatians were like the Romans in these matters*, lameness in the right foot not less than epilepsy would claim their attention. Krenkel, however, would strengthen his thesis by dragging in the case of the lad at the Mount of Transfiguration. The result is unwittingly most grotesque. It makes Paul an epileptic idiot! For the ailment of the boy was undoubtedly epileptic idiocy. Krenkel's theory thus fails entirely.

But a theory of epilepsy can never maintain itself. In the first place, it is contradicted by the σκόλοψ. The unconsciousness of the epileptic state is void of pain. On recovery from an attack there may be some headache or some complaint of bruising. But there is nothing corresponding to the intense and prolonged agony of a 'stake for the flesh.' In the second place, it is impossible to find room in the history of the apostle for such an impetuous disorder. Had there been any taint of this sort in the constitution of Paul, that was bound to have manifested itself on many occasions, as when stoned at Lystra, mobbed at Jerusalem, or pleading repeatedly for his life. Yet under these most trying circumstances, there arises not the remotest suspicion of a disabling attack of illness. Certain uncharitable Corinthians declared that Paul was beside himself, and Festus called him mad. But no one ever ventured to make what was in some respects a more damaging charge by asserting that he was the victim of the disease which Greek and Roman called 'sacred' and deemed accursed.

3. *Malarial Fever*.—This is Ramsay's conjecture. He holds that Paul was overtaken in Pamphylia by 'a species of chronic malarial fever.' Any constitutional weakness was liable to be brought out by the sudden plunge into the enervating atmosphere of Pamphylia, after the fatigue, hardship, and excitement of the work in Cyprus, culminating in the supreme effort at Paphos. The natural treatment for such an illness was removal to the higher ground of the interior, Antioch being a suitable place. In some constitutions, malarial fever tends to recur in very distressing and prostrating paroxysms whenever one's energies are taxed for a great effort. Such an attack for the time being absolutely incapacitating; the sufferer can only lie and feel

himself a shaking and helpless weakling, when he ought to be at work. He feels contempt and loathing for himself, and believes that others feel equal contempt and loathing. In the publicity of Oriental life, Paul could have no privacy. In every paroxysm he would lie exposed to the pity or contempt of strangers. If he were first seen in a Galatian house or village, lying in the mud on the shady side of a wall for two hours shaking like an aspen leaf, the gratitude that he expresses to the Galatians, because they did not despise nor reject his infirmity, was natural and deserved. Ramsay finds strong corroboration of this view in the phrase, 'a stake in the flesh.' That is the peculiar headache which accompanies the paroxysms, and described by several persons as 'like a red-hot bar thrust through the forehead.'

But against this interpretation of Paul's 'infirmity' there are several decided objections. Self-aborrence on the part of a patient suffering from chronic malarial fever is a novel symptom, unknown to clinical medicine. Headache also is not at all the constant and aggravated feature of this fever which the theory demands. Another clamant question is whether this illness could reasonably have called forth the contempt and loathing of the Galatians. The answer must still be in the negative, unless something very ex-

ceptional be put in evidence. In Eastern lands the spectacle of a wayfarer struck down in circumstances similar to the preceding is by no means uncommon. The sufferer may be treated at worst with indifference; never with contempt and loathing. The latter sentiment would be intelligible, could it be shown that the Galatians regarded malarial fever as a sacred disease; for it is not in itself repulsive. Ramsay quotes the suggestion of Hogarth to the effect that this ailment was often inflicted by the God on those approaching the sanctuary in impurity. But it is extremely doubtful if malarial fever were endemic in the Galatian highlands at all. Pisidian Antioch, the scene of the incident, is about 3600 feet above the sea, and that ought to have placed it well beyond the dangerous zone. Its immunity in this respect is to be inferred in the choice of it as a health resort by these travellers. If Paul were suffering from malarial fever, he was not in the least likely to seek recovery in a fever-haunted district. This theory, anyhow, is inadequate to the occasion, as it gives too slight a meaning to the 'stake for the flesh,' and fails to account for the suppressed contempt and loathing of the Galatians. It also overlooks other points of importance to be dealt with in the sequel.

(To be continued.)

Contributions and Comments.

The Confusion of Tongues.

IN the 11th chapter of Genesis we have a primeval account of a yet more primeval occurrence, viz. the confounding of human language, by a stroke from which mankind has never yet recovered. Generation after generation of Bible readers has taken for granted that this stroke was a miraculous one, yet there is nothing whatever in the narrative to say so. 'Go to, let us go down, and there confound their language,' does not necessarily imply the use of supernatural means to effect the purpose. It was more probably accomplished by a natural process. May we not consider the matter in the light thrown in recent years on such subjects by the progress of historical and linguistic study?

Can we not imagine that the human race, possessing in its comparative infancy one homogeneous speech, became in the course of its wanderings separated into various tribes or peoples, inhabiting districts divided from one another by mountain chains or broad rivers, with few facilities for trade or intercourse, and no literature whatever? In these circumstances, would not each separate tribe or nation develop the original speech into forms which its inaccessible neighbours could not comprehend? We know how this has gone on of old time in the British Isles; how a Highlander and an East Anglian and a Yorkshireman and a Cornishman have difficulty in talking together. We detect our Transatlantic cousins at once by their accent, despite the glorious literary heritage to which they and we are alike heirs. Geographical

barriers have done their work in our own day, and were these not much more potent in the regions surrounding Mesopotamia among the first descendants of Noah?

My theory is this. Some great leader, or enterprising genius, formed the project of building a high tower, evidently to serve as a landmark, lest people should be scattered abroad on the face of the whole earth. Labourers were summoned from far and near, and it was only while they were working together that the members of various tribes found that they could not understand one another. A quiet process of variation had been going on for centuries, but the effect of it only became evident when many persons were brought together for the same object. These simple people would not understand historical processes, and the impression on their minds would be that this confusion was caused by a sudden intervention of the Deity. As they so believed, it was traditionally handed down that such an intervention had really taken place, and thus it is recorded for us in one of the earliest literary documents the world possesses.

MARGARET D. GIBSON.

Cambridge.

The Hittites of Southern Palestine.

SOME years ago Brugsch drew attention to a stela in the Louvre (C. 1), in which Montu-nesu, an Egyptian official who lived under the first two kings of the Twelfth dynasty, speaks of 'the palaces of the Khetau' or 'Hittites' as having been overthrown in the neighbourhood of the Montu and the Herusha, and therefore on the southern borders of Palestine. The fact that the name of the Hittites occurred in this inscription was subsequently denied, and I was thus prevented from appealing to it when dealing with the question of the existence of Hittites in the south of Canaan. But Mr. Percy Newberry has lately been making a fresh copy of the inscription, and he tells me that Brugsch was quite right, the land of the Hittites being really mentioned in the text. The Old Testament statements as to the presence of Hittites in the south of Palestine in Abrahamic days are consequently monumentally confirmed.

The German excavators on the site of Megiddo (Tell el-Mutasellim) have discovered an early

Israelitish seal which, according to Professor Kautzsch, bears the name of 'Shima', the servant of Jeroboam.'

The Septuagint contains very remarkable testimony to the Egyptian chronology of Manetho. As is well known, the Greek translators of the Pentateuch lengthened the chronology of the patriarchal period so as to make it agree with what they believed to be the chronology of Egypt. From the Creation to the Flood they counted 2262 years. Now the first period into which Manetho divided the history of the united Egyptian monarchy, extending from Menes to the end of the Eleventh dynasty and occupying the first Tomos of his work, lasted, according to Africanus, 2280 years, but when we come to add together the reigns of the kings included in it, we find that it was really 2263 years. This agreement between the chronology of the Septuagint and that of Manetho can hardly be an accident, and when we remember that the Septuagint translation of the Pentateuch was apparently made before the publication of Manetho's work, we may infer that the chronology given by him was no invention of his own, but was that which was already recognized by native authority. From the Deluge to the migration of Jacob into Egypt, the Septuagint reckons 1362 years. This would bring us into the middle of the Hyksos period, if the copyists of Manetho are to be trusted, and I would suggest accordingly that the Hebrew translators identified Jacob with Jacob-el, whom scarabs have shown to have been one of the Hyksos Pharaohs. That the Israelites could be identified with the Hyksos we know from Josephus.

A. H. SAYCE.

Oxford.

The Anointing of David.

PROFESSOR MURISON'S sketch of 'The Character of David' in the June issue of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES will strike many as unjustifiably severe in its condemnation of the king. I do not mean that it challenges a traditional hero-worship, but that it misrepresents the biblical statements. May I illustrate this by calling attention to the professor's references to David's anointing by Samuel? He says, 'The prophet incited David, whose ability he discovered, to aspire to the throne (1 S 16¹²). Saul, a shrewd man of affairs, soon discovered at

least David's share in the plot.' Later on this sentence occurs, 'Samuel has no hesitation in circulating a false report about the cause of his visit to the house of Jesse.' The chapter referred to does not seem to warrant such an interpretation. It is true that Samuel believes it to be God's will that one of Jesse's sons should become king. But there is no suggestion in the chapter that the prophet ever revealed this purpose either to Jesse or to David. He called the family to a sacrifice, and during his visit he anointed David for some divine purpose. But is there not a simple explanation? If David was to become king, he must feel from his youth that he is consecrated to God's service. His anointing by Samuel was not an anointing as king. It was a call to a mission for God. By submitting, David accepted the responsibility of one set apart for God's work. The anointing was a source of consecration, at which the young shepherd of Bethlehem heard a divine call, and answered, 'Here am I, send me.' But he did not know at all then what his mission would be.

We are reminded of Samson in his youthful days. When his playmates made such reference, as they dared make, to the long hair of their strong leader in sport, the lad would wander off to some lonely hill crest and sit down to muse upon his destiny. He knew he was different from other boys. His mother often told him of the vows that summoned him to special work for God. And though he only learned what his work was later, the thought of his dedication was with him always, and was a formative influence on his character. Samuel himself grew up in the temple under similar conditions. The vows of the Lord were upon him, and he was not free as he grew up to choose a profession. Is not this the explanation of David's anointing? There was no 'plot,' no 'inciting David to aspire to the throne,' no 'circulating a false report about the cause of his visit.' Samuel knew that one of Jesse's sons must become king one day. Therefore he realized that this son's training as one consecrated to God's service should begin at once. So he went to Bethlehem, not to anoint David to kingship secretly, but to offer a sacrifice at which the young man whom God was calling should receive his call to devote his life to God. This was all the meaning of the anointing. It is the explanation of the Bible: 'The Spirit of the Lord came upon David from that day forward.' Is it uncharitable to suppose

that David's brothers were not altogether sorry that the choice had fallen upon some one else? Jesse might appreciate the honour of a call from God, and might expect an older son to be chosen. Samuel might judge that God intended to dethrone Saul at once, and that a full-grown man would be selected, for he knew that the call meant the kingship ultimately. But nobody else knew that at the time. And probably David's brothers would not welcome a summons to a life of surrender, thinking it might involve more loss than gain. As for David himself, we can imagine that he returned to his sheep, much as a young fellow would go home after attending a religious service in which he had publicly offered himself for any work to which God called him. The ruddy 'herdladdie' did not realize at all the destiny that lay before him. He only knew that God's prophet had solemnly set him aside for God's work; and that his whole outlook was changed by this act. He was no longer the youngest son of a large family. He was now devoted to God; and he must try to live wholly for God, and must wait for God to show him what He would have him do. It was only in later years and through the plain speech of subsequent events that David recognized his vocation in the kingship of Israel.

Did not this early consecration help to shape his whole career? When the crown was put upon his head, he remembered the holy oil which the aged prophet had poured there many years before. He knew that he was king by way of a call, as much as Paul was 'apostle by way of a call.' And despite his failures, the glory of David was that he tried earnestly to rule Israel as the vicegerent for God.

J. E. ROBERTS.

Union Chapel, Manchester.

The Unjust Steward.

I do not think your four correspondents on this subject have said the last word on the interpretation of this parable, which is undoubtedly difficult, and becomes impossible unless the ruling idea of the parable is closely adhered to. What does our Lord wish to illustrate, and what does He wish to teach? The fact He has in His mind is that worldly wealth fails; inevitably it ceases to be useful to a man, as we all recognize, on his death. How does He illustrate this fact? By the case of

a steward who is to be dismissed from his position of authority. We are apt to think that the steward's action is with a view to gaining the approval of his master, which he does gain. There is no suggestion of this in the parable. He accepts his dismissal as inevitable, and so disregards his master altogether in his calculations. So we are taught to accept the failing of the mammon of unrighteousness, and to act accordingly. In the parallelism of the parable the mammon of unrighteousness corresponds to the authority of the steward, which he is to hold only for a brief period, as we do our share of worldly wealth. By the use of his authority the steward makes to himself friends who will receive him into their houses. Thus we are taught to use our wealth to make friends who will receive us into eternal habitations. The plural 'friends' has been a great difficulty, but, as Goebel points out, the plural may be disregarded, for 'the general nature of the language is conditioned by the close connexion with the parable.' 'The exhortation, "make to yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness," cannot certainly be meant in the sense (as the majority, however, explain) that with mammon we are to gain for ourselves friends among *men*, because it cannot be said of such friends that they receive into eternal habitations.' If we accept this incisive statement of Goebel's it sweeps away many of the speculations with which the interpretation of this parable has been burdened, and among these the 'bizarre conclusion' and 'Machiavellian morals' of Mr. Latham to which Mr. Hooper refers.

The parallelism of the parable may be put as follows:—

The steward = men.

His dismissal = death.

His authority = wealth.

The friends he makes = God.

Their homes = eternal habitations.

The prudence of the steward = the prudence of men in providing against the future life.

And if this seems to leave the difficulty of the master's approbation of his steward's doubtful action unexplained, does it require explanation in view of the words 'the sons of this world are for their own generation wiser than the sons of the light'?

A full and carefully reasoned statement of the above interpretation of this parable is to be found

in Goebel on the Parables, and is perhaps the masterpiece of his invaluable book.

Leith.

ANDREW N. BOGLE.

Resen.

GENESIS x. 12.

ON the identifications of this town see T. G. Pinches in the *Dictionary of the Bible*, iv. 229. He mentions first that Byzantine authors and Ptolemy identified it with Rhesina or Rhesaina on the Khabour, an impossible identification from geographical reasons. At last he tells that Sayce, in the *Academy* for 1st May 1880, found it as Rêš-êni in a list of eighteen cities or small towns, from which Sennacherib dug canals communicating with the river Khouser or Khosr, in order to supply them with drinking water. Pinches remarks: 'Whether this be the Resen of Genesis or not is uncertain'; but he might have added that already the Syriac lexicographer Bar-Bahlul found it there. For he writes in his *Lexicon* (ed. Duval, col. 1907): '*Rasan, rîš'ainā* is the city *Rās-el-'ain*. And it is above Nineveh one *parasang*; and of it the Scripture spoke, and not that of Gazîrta, i.e. in Mesopotamia.'

In fact, the map of Kiepert shows a place *rāzal-'ain* at one of the eastern springs of the river Hōsar (Khouser or Khosr with Pinches), and G. Hoffmann, *Akten persischer Märtyrer* (1880), p. 183, mentions that already Fletcher, *Narrative*, ii. 77, saw in this Rasalain a corruption of Resen. Bar-Bahlul, Fletcher, and Hoffmann ought, therefore, to be quoted at the side of Sayce in any article on Resen.¹

EB. NESTLE.

Maulbronn.

'Mice' and 'Emerods.'

THE compilers of the Massora, in the written text (*Kethib*) of 1 S 5⁶ and 64.⁵ found the word עֶמְרוֹם, and for some reason recommended the *gen.* טַחְרִים, which has been followed by the A.V. with its translation 'emerods' for 'hæmorrhoids.' The

¹ Sayce himself mentions the identification of Resen with Res-eni in the Bavian inscription of Sennacherib in this journal (viii. 181). Compare further on the name, Lagarde, *Mittheilungen*, iii. 71. See a longer article in the forthcoming volume of the *Zeitschrift der deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*.

R.V. has followed the *Kethib*, and translated *tumours*, with the marginal rendering *plague-boils*. The translation *tumours* is colourless and correct, but I hope to show that *plague-boils*, or rather, to use a sadly familiar technical term, *buboes*, is better, for the reference to mice in chap. 64.⁵ with the significant LXX reading¹ of 5⁶ characterizes the Philistine epidemic as one of true bubonic plague.

Again, if we compare 2 K 19⁸⁵ with the Egyptian legend recorded by Herodotus ii. 141, although there is no mention of 'emerods' or tumours, the pestilence to which the biblical account evidently ascribes the destruction of the army of Sennacherib, with the ἐπίχουσιν of mice in Herodotus is easily recognizable as bubonic plague. On the parallel passage in Isaiah and the Egyptian legend, Delitzsch, G. A. Smith, and Skinner (Cambridge Bible) have written so admirably that little can be added to the light which they have given. Professor G. A. Smith remarks that the mouse was, in Egypt, a symbol of sudden destruction and even of the plague, and Professor Skinner says substantially the same.

If the Massoretes had seen such an epidemic of plague as is now claiming nearly 50,000 victims weekly in India, they would probably not have 'corrected' *tumours* into *emerods*, and commentators on 1 S, 2 K, and Is 37 would not have found it necessary to frame hypotheses to account for the mice. עֲכָבָר, like the μῦς of the LXX and the *mus* of the Vulgate, is probably a comprehensive term signifying rats, mice, field-mice, perhaps the *jirboa*² and other 'small deer'; for the Rabbis, and even Aristotle and Pliny, left a little for Buffon and Darwin to correct in their zoology!

The present plague epidemic began in Bombay, in quarters where grain-shops abound. The rats, which swarm in such places, began to die in large numbers, and where dead rats were found, the plague began to attack human beings. Since the terrible outbreak of 1900-1 in this district and city of Patna, I have been an eye-witness of the same facts, having worked as a volunteer among

the sick and dying, cremating dead rats and mice and squirrels, disinfecting, dressing buboes, administering medicine, and providing necessaries. Rats and mice began to die in the grain-shops near this mission-house in December last, and an outbreak of plague was the immediate consequence. The rats then fled eastward towards the city, and, dying, have carried the infection with them.

The 'emerods in the secret parts' and the apparent reference to the Philistine plague in Ps 78⁶⁶, are explainable by the fact that in about 60 per cent. of cases the buboes or glandular swellings appear in the groin, in fewer cases in the axilla, and in fewer still in the neck. Surgical treatment is proportionately difficult, although the pain is so terrible that even high-class women will do and suffer things which, in any other disease, would be out of the question. It is interesting to know that in the great plague which raged in India in the time of the Emperor Jahangir a rat was seen to run about after the manner of drunkards, and then drop down dead.³ This occurred in a household in Agra, and soon afterward a slave girl sickened and developed buboes. Seventeen people died in that house in eight or nine days.

Moreover, in the case of the Assyrian epidemic, the biblical accounts speak of the angel of the Lord being the agent of destruction. Mohammedans, when politely refusing to observe the most elementary sanitary rules for the prevention of plague, make the excuse that being a 'breath or wind from God' it is useless to attempt to resist it. And how the plague bearing *rodentia* 'mar the land,' is easily understood by going into a district like this, where thrice since 1900 we have lost 15,000 or more people in a few months. Villages depopulated, towns falling into decay, and panic and death on all sides.⁴

Finally, the sudden panic and flight of Sennacherib's host, with many falling in their headlong flight, φευγόντων πεσέειν πολλούς, is no strange story to those of us who have seen two-thirds of the population of a city like this (153,000) crowding every way of exit in their panic and desire to escape; leaving those who have died at camping-

³ Just what occurred a few yards from the spot where I am writing, a few weeks ago.

⁴ So in 1616-18, 'Plague destroyed many villages and parganas.' In Kandahar, in 1618, mice devastated the country and then died. Plague was raging in India all the time. See Elliot's *History of India as told by its own Historians*, vol. vi.

¹ 'And in the midst of the land mice were brought forth, and there was a great and deadly destruction in the city.'

² Johnson's Persian and Arabic Dictionary, and apparently W. Robertson Smith, translate عكابر, 'akábir (plural of ákbar) *jirboa*. See Clarendon Press Hebrew Dictionary, s.v. עֲכָבָר. The modern Arabic version of Dr. Eli Smith, however, translates عكابر by وبار *wabar*, not by عكابر, 'akbar.

ground after camping-ground, and spreading disease and death after they go. The same thing may be seen on a small scale when cholera breaks out in a cantonment, fortress, or camp. Army surgeons dread the effects of panic almost as much as those of the disease itself, and send the men on from camp to camp until the disease dies out.

GEO. J. DANN.

*Baptist Mission,
Bankipur, Patna.*

Raka.

THE surmise of the Master of the Supreme Court in your March issue with regard to the word (?) *Raka* is very interesting. Among the natives (kafirs) of this part of South Africa there is an expression, or rather interjection, in common use, which answers almost exactly to the suggestion of Mr. King. If we borrow the Scotch guttural *ch*, it might be written *āchā*, and it expresses strong disapproval or disgust at something which has been said, or contempt of the speaker. Much as we might say, 'You *stupid*,' or 'It's no use talking to you.' Oddly enough, this interjection is, so far as I know, never written: its use is simply colloquial.

(FATHER) SYDNEY, S.S.C.

*S. Cuthbert's, Tsolo,
Griqualand East, South Africa.*

Jerahmeel.

FIVE parts of the *Critica Biblica* have now been published: (i.) Isaiah and Jeremiah; (ii.) Ezekiel and Minor Prophets; (iii.) First and Second Samuel; (iv.) First and Second Kings; (v.) Joshua and Judges (London: A. & C. Black; price 2s. 6d. for the first issue, and 3s. for each of the others). The purpose of the notes contained in this publication is sufficiently well known to scholars. They are intended to justify and to supplement some of the critical conclusions reached by Professor Cheyne in his articles in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*. In the Prologue to the first part issued in the series, it is frankly avowed and claimed that the positions put forward mark the dawn of a new era in Old Testament criticism. And undoubtedly, if we are to accept the general principles underlying Professor Cheyne's most recent speculations, we shall have

to alter entirely our view not only of the history of Israel but of the text of the Old Testament.

At the very outset we may say plainly that nothing that Professor Cheyne has advanced either in the *Encyclopædia Biblica* or the *Critica Biblica* has convinced us that his new reading of Israel's history has any solid basis. It is, indeed, far from a pleasing task to assume an attitude of hostility to one whose name is identified with such splendid services to Old Testament science, and who has helped to kindle the enthusiasm of so many students of Scripture. Yet we feel compelled to say that the latest work of Professor Cheyne can have no other effect than to render the whole science of Biblical Criticism suspect. Already 'Jerahmeel,' that Proteus-like form, which makes its appearance in so many unlikely places in the Old Testament, has done us much harm; and if that 'sober' and 'cautious' criticism which Professor Cheyne so much dislikes is to hold its own, it behoves its friends to repudiate the 'Jerahmeel' aberration from it. This has already been done in Germany by Professor Steuernagel in the January number of the *Studien und Kritiken*. Perhaps some of our readers may be interested to know how an 'advanced' critic like Dr. Steuernagel views the contentions of the *Critica Biblica*, especially as hitherto the brilliant services of Professor Cheyne have met nowhere with more ungrudging recognition than in Germany.

Dr. Steuernagel sets out with summarizing the general results reached by Professor Cheyne. North Arabia is the determining factor in Old Testament history. Its kingdom of Muṣri takes the place we used to assign to Egypt. (Miṣraim). But, above all, the name 'Jerahmeel' is the 'new key' that unlocks many a door of mystery in the Old Testament. In the Massoretic text there are only ten occurrences of this name (or its gentilic), and of these only eight come into consideration, namely, 1 S 27¹⁰ 30²⁹, 1 Ch 2⁹, 25, 26, 27, 33, 42. All that we learn from these passages is that the Jerahmeelites were a tribe in the Negeb, side by side with Judahites and Kenites, and that their favour was courted by David. But Professor Cheyne, by applying to the Hebrew text a system of rules derived from supposed cases of textual corruption, obtains the name 'Jerahmeel' in hundreds of passages where hitherto there has been no suspicion of corruption; and thus obtains for this North Arabian people a vastly more important rôle.

One instance may suffice of the way in which upon this theory Israel's history must be rewritten. It was not Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon, but Nebron-Ašhur of Jerahmeel that carried Judah captive, and it was not Cyrus, the king of the Persians, but Harith, king of the Nabatæans, that permitted them to return to their own land. Seeing that the name 'Jerahmeel' is thus obtained, on an average, three times on every page, there will be in the five parts of the work before us some 1500 occurrences of it in the Old Testament now discovered by Professor Cheyne for the first time. The author of these corrections is quite convinced that by adopting them we get 'a connected and intelligible view of the events referred to.' This is not the experience either of Professor Steuernagel or of any scholar known to us who has examined the 'Jerahmeel' theory. In fact, we have to complain, as Dr. Steuernagel does, that this entity called 'Jerahmeel' is extremely difficult to grasp, and that in the last resort the bewildering result is reached that all the peoples and tribes that play any part in Israel's history are Jerahmeelites. It would, indeed, hardly be going too far to say that there is not a single word in the Old Testament which might not, on Professor Cheyne's principles, be pronounced a corruption of 'Jerahmeel.'

Many will share Dr. Steuernagel's 'feeling of the keenest regret that the immense labours and the brilliant penetration of Professor Cheyne, to which we owed so much of value in former days, are no longer at the disposal of true scientific progress, but at that of a treacherous will-o'-the-wisp.'

J. A. SELBIE.

Maryculter, Aberdeen.

Quotation Types.

IN THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for February (xv. 237) I offered some Notes on Quotation Marks in the New Testament; this time I beg to ask who was it who introduced into the Greek Testament the convenient usage to print quotations in a special type? I know it first from the Greek Testament of Tregelles, who states (p. vi. of his Introductory Notice, 1857): 'Citations from the Old Testament are denoted by a different Greek type being employed.'

EB. NESTLE.

Maulbronn.

Unscientific Points of View in the Babel-Bibel Controversy.

IT is much to be regretted that the solution of the *Babel-Bibel* problem has come to be hampered in an extraordinary fashion. Truth to tell, there are real difficulties enough in connexion with the magnitude of the questions that arise and the partial obscurity of the sources. But not a few have set themselves to complicate this question altogether beyond due bounds. This they do by introducing into the debate a number of unscientific elements.

The latest instance of this kind is seen in the attempt to array different departments of scientific study against one another. Not long ago there was published a brochure entitled *Theologie und Assyriologie im Streit um Babel und Bibel*. Its author, Mr. Otto Weber, takes it upon him to assert that almost all the works emanating from scientific theologians during the *Babel-Bibel* controversy have one definite aim, namely, to inform and to reassure the churches which are threatened in the hold of their most sacred possessions (*l.c.* p. 9). To this category he assigns above all my brochure, *Bibel und Babel*. Yet I have the perfectly calm consciousness that I began my examination of the *Babel-Bibel* question with the same desire to reach historical truth as could have animated any one else. I can also wait quite calmly till someone brings forward a single proof of the opposite. It seems to me, moreover, that the distinction drawn in this matter between theologians and Assyriologists is quite groundless, and this method of conducting the controversy is very unfair. We are all honest seekers after truth, and, in answer to the suspicions of Weber, I would exclaim, in the words of Lessing: '*O hätte ich einen mehr gefunden, dem es genügt ein Wahrheitssucher zu sein!*'

Again, it is unscientific to measure the advance in knowledge of the truth by the advance from an earlier position held by any particular science. This is done, however, by the author above named. He says: 'Step by step Old Testament Theology suffers concessions to be forced upon it so long as the general picture it draws is not destroyed' (*l.c.* p. 5). But this is, in the first place, not true. Let one compare, for instance, the picture of the history of the literature of the Old Testament which is presented in such works as Dr. Driver's *Introduction* or my own *Einleitung*. Is it not totally different from the picture contained in the

'Introductions' of previous centuries? What a complete breach with the dogma of verbal inspiration is seen in recent works! But, in the second place, it is unreasonable to make the slowness and the continuity of the forward movement of a science a matter of reproach to those that cultivate it. Let the movement of a science be criticised from the point of view of the solidity of the reasons for that movement. To estimate the health of a science by the amount of upheaval it occasions in its domain is unscientific.

Another strange point of view is seen in the way in which lately some have tried to depreciate scholars who, as they say, have not 'actually advanced the problem by positive fellow-labour' (*l.c.* p. 9). But who are those who, in the view of our author, have thus contributed 'positive' fellow-labour? Those only who have approved of the question, 'How do the two—Babel and Bible—exhibit themselves as rays from *one* focus of culture, as fruits differing indeed in their development and form, but yet clearly the products of *one* soil?' (*l.c.* p. 10). Weber does not see that this question implies a whole position. Whoever accepts the 'How' of this question must *already* have reached the conviction *that* Babel and Bible are nothing more than rays proceeding from one and the same focus of culture. But no one who has not, by means of historical investigation, reached the conclusion that Israel's culture can be traced, without exception, to the influences at work in Babylon, can assent to the 'How' of Weber's question. And if he declines to do so, he is branded as not having actually advanced the problem by *positive* fellow-labour. Fortunately, however, Weber is not self-consistent. For we find him also saying that 'he looks for an advance towards the solution of the questions at issue, as the result of a serious examination of Winckler's premises and conclusions' (*l.c.* p. 6). That is quite right. For the idea has never occurred to me to aim at anything else than a serious examination of the premises and conclusions of certain Assyriologists.

Another remarkable course of procedure is followed when a number of attempts to solve the *Babel-Bibel* question are contemptuously brushed aside, simply because their authors have not drawn at first hand upon cuneiform sources (*l.c.* p. 15). Now, let us here look at a parallel. There must be not a few scholars, even in English-speaking countries, who prize Max Duncker's *Geschichte des*

Altentums. This work was indeed regarded in its time as a splendid monument of the critical method of writing history. But was its author an Oriental philologist? Was he an expert in the department of Indian or Old Persian or Egyptian languages? No. He merely availed himself of the best editions of the literature of India, Persia, etc. He saw his task to be to examine the value of these sources with the practised eye of the Comparative historian, to sift their contents critically, and from the materials so obtained to sketch a picture of the course of ancient history. But this is precisely the nature of what I and other representatives of Old Testament science have sought to do. We have simply endeavoured to compare the materials and to test the assertions put forward by those who have cultivated the science of Babylon-Assyrian philology. To make this a matter of reproach against us is to deny entirely the right of an equal footing to Oriental philology and to Comparative history.

We need no argument to show, finally, that it is unscientific to mingle investigation with dictatorial pronouncements and personal attacks. And yet how much there is of this intermixture in Delitzsch's *Babel-Bibel* works! There we read of Jules Oppert's 'oddities,' or of König's and Oettli's 'blind zeal,' or of Gunkel's habit of measuring things by a 'petty standard'; and when Delitzsch comes to speak of my acquaintance with the cuneiform language, he cannot go far enough in his strictures. The injustice of this, I think, I have exposed in the third part of a little work just published (*Die Babel-Bibel-Frage und die wissenschaftliche Methode*; Berlin: Edwin Runge; price 70 pfennigs), and Delitzsch has all the less right to attack other students in this fashion, seeing that he is himself chargeable with not a few mistakes in Old Testament matters, as will be found shown in the same work. My main purpose in the latter is to test the assertions of Delitzsch and Winckler in the *Babel-Bibel* controversy by the requirements of the real scientific method, and I think I have succeeded in showing that the comparative and the historical methods receive anything but justice in their writings. Moreover, I hope that, in regard to the respective levels of Israelitish and of Babylon-Assyrian prophetism, I have made an important contribution towards fixing the true relation between the culture of Israel and that of Babylon.

ED. KÖNIG.

Bonn.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, St. Cyrus, Montrose.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

IT is a good many months since Mrs. Gibson sent a note to THE EXPOSITORY TIMES on the Parable of the Unrighteous Steward. Since then there has been a steady stream of communication on the subject, not half of which could be printed. A new book on the Parables has just been issued. Its claim to notice lies in the comparison which is carried through it between certain of the Parables and the Beatitudes. In one place the Parable of the Unrighteous Steward is explained. And which is the Beatitude it is found to illustrate? It is the Beatitude of the Pure in Heart.

The book is written by the Rev. A. Allen Brockington, M.A. Its title is *The Parables of the Way* (Longmans; 2s. 6d. net). In an introductory note, the Rev. F. A. Clarke, M.A., Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, directs attention to Mr. Brockington's original view of the Unrighteous Steward, and we turn to that chapter at once.

What is its lesson? We need not stay with particulars. Let the controversy between those who affirm and those who deny a spiritual application in every detail of a parable be settled some other time. All agree that at the heart of each parable there is a lesson. What is the lesson of the Parable of the Unrighteous Steward? Mr. Brockington says it is Single-mindedness.

Did the steward's lord commend him—surely we need not ask if our Lord did—for his dishonesty? He did not. He commended him for his single-eyed foresight and endeavour. The steward used his opportunity for a certain end, he used it solely for that end. Was it a selfish end? That is not the point. The point is that whatever the end was he was single-minded in pursuing it. His single-mindedness—that was the virtue his lord commended in the steward, that is the virtue our Lord recommends to us.

Now Single-mindedness is Purity. You thought Purity of Heart was chastity, the absence of sins of the flesh, the absence of lustful thinking? It is more than that. It goes deeper than that, deeper down into the personality. 'Purity of matter,' says the manual of science, 'is connected with the vital and energetic connexion between its particles.' Purity of heart is connected with the vital and energetic connexion between the soul and God. In the Apocalyptic vision they that have washed their robes follow the Lamb whithersoever He goeth. They have no divided aims. Their Purity consists in their Single-mindedness.

Mr. Brockington quotes Ruskin. 'With the idea of purity,' says Ruskin, 'comes that of spirituality; for the essential characteristic of matter is its inertia, whence, by adding to its

purity of energy, we may in some measure spiritualize even matter itself.' He quotes Tennyson. He quotes Tennyson on 'Sir Galahad the Pure'—

My good blade carves the casques of men,
My tough lance thrusteth sure;
My strength is as the strength of ten,
Because my heart is pure.

But Mr. Clarke, who writes Mr. Brockington's preface, quotes to yet better purpose. For he quotes Dr. Hort, who says that the pure or single in heart are those who have no double thoughts, no taint of falsehood; he quotes St. James, who says, 'Purify your hearts, ye double-minded'; and to show the connexion between single-mindedness and seeing God—for it is the Pure in Heart that, like Sir Galahad, shall see God—he quotes most pertinently from Browning. Of the irresolute, of the men and women of divided aims, Browning says—

They see not God, I know,
Nor all that chivalry of His,
The soldier-saints who, row on row,
Burn upward each to his point of bliss—
Since, *the end of life being manifest*,
He had burned his way thro' the world to this.

At the 'Annual Meeting' of Mansfield College, Oxford, Professor Buchanan Gray delivered a lecture on 'Biblical Study and Travel in Palestine,' which is reported in the *Examiner* for June 23. The title of the lecture does not name two separate things, but one thing. Professor Gray's purpose was to encourage the study of the Bible by means of travel in Palestine.

Is this not done already? Not by this country. The Germans do it, and the Jesuits, and the Americans. In Beirut there is a Syrian Protestant College, which is an American institution, and the Jesuit University there has an Oriental Faculty. In Jerusalem there are German and American 'Schools,' as well as a 'school' of the Dominican Fathers. There is no School, Faculty, or Foundation yet for any British subject.

Dr. Buchanan Gray desires to see his countrymen take their place in the geographical study of the Bible. It is true there is in Palestine a British (and American) Palestine Exploration Fund. And under the guidance of Mr. Stewart Macalister that Fund is doing wonderful work at Gezer. But the Palestine Exploration Fund is handicapped for lack of money. It is a Fund without funds. And great as the enterprise is, heroic as have been the efforts of its officers at home and abroad, the Englishman who visits Palestine and sees the work of the Palestine Exploration Fund stopped here and hampered there, finds little occasion to think well of his countrymen's liberality.

It is not, however, for the purpose of digging below the surface, but for the purpose of exploring and interpreting what is above the ground, that Dr. Buchanan Gray desires to see a new 'school' established in Jerusalem. He is not even sure if he would establish a new school. It would be more economical to co-operate with such existing institutions as are suitable for English-speaking students. It would also be more profitable. Dr. Gray has examined the three institutions in Jerusalem. The American school was founded four years ago. Scholars so eminent as Professor Torrey of Yale, Professor Mitchell of Boston, Professor Barton of Bryn Mawr College, and Professor Lewis Paton of Hartford Seminary, have been its successive directors. A permanent director will be appointed by and by. The German school has a permanent director already. 'It is fortunate,' says Dr. Gray, 'in being under the direction of so accomplished and distinguished a scholar as Professor Dalman,' the author of *The Words of Jesus*.

But the most fully equipped and most active school in Jerusalem is that of the Dominicans. Dr. Gray was especially impressed with the excellence of its library. 'All the leading periodicals devoted to the languages or subjects of the Bible are taken, including, for example, among those published in England, the *Jewish Quarterly Review*, the *Journal*

of *Theological Studies*, and *The Expository Times*.' It might not be desirable, and it probably would not be possible, to affiliate an English school of research with that of the Dominicans. But Dr. Gray found the Dominican Fathers most ready to assist him in his studies, and he does not doubt that they would offer the same unattached assistance to others.

The Schools are there already. 'What we now need,' says Professor Gray, 'is at least one or two scholarships, offered yearly to English students, and open without limit of Church or Creed.'

On the 27th of May the Rev. W. Douglas Mackenzie was inducted into the office of President of the Theological Seminary in Hartford, Connecticut, and delivered his inaugural address. What subject did he choose? There are many most interesting and some very entertaining subjects for a theologian of our day to choose. Dr. Douglas Mackenzie chose the Absolute.

There is just one thing, he holds, that is of vital consequence in our day. It is the question whether truth is a matter of opinion or of absolute authority. We have a moral law. Why should we obey it? Is it because it has been found expedient for the sake of society to do so, and for our own sake in the long run? If that is the only reason, we shall not obey it. For at the time when we are debating whether we should obey it or not, we are not concerned about society, and are ready to let our own future welfare take its chance. But if we have a moral law which is the absolute will of the Absolute, then we cannot choose but obey it. 'There is nothing,' says President Mackenzie, 'which we need more to-day than a theology which shall establish securely the ancient prerogative of God as the supreme and the absolute fountain of definite laws for the conduct of man.'

How is theology to set about it? There is only one method, and theology must use it, use it

loyally. It is the historical method. We must investigate the past. Now, almost the moment we turn to the past we find ourselves in the presence of One who stands towards the religious development of mankind in a relation which is unparalleled. Who is this? We are not seriously detained along the way until we come to Him. We are not seriously detained by Moses or Gotama or Plato. But when we come to Him we are completely arrested. For He claims to possess the sinless consciousness; He asserts the authority to forgive men's sins; He offers His death as essential to man's recovery of right relations with God and essential to man's recovery of right relations with himself; He sets Himself, in short, upon the throne of the universal conscience of man.

How do we know this? By the way of historical investigation. There is no other way. By historical investigation we come upon Jesus. By historical investigation we discover what His claims were. We call these claims the manifestation of His self-consciousness. When we see, by actual historical investigation, that Jesus Christ's self-consciousness manifested itself in these ways, we see what Jesus Christ Himself was. Now these claims are absolute. They are the claims of the Absolute God. If Jesus Christ can make good these claims, we are in the presence of a moral law that is not a matter of expediency, but of absolute personal obligation.

Now there are two ways of discovering whether Christ makes good His claims. Both are historical. But the one belongs to the past, the other to the ever present. First of all, we must examine the records of His own time. What does history say about Him? Did He in His own life and conduct fulfil the claims which He made for Himself. Was He sinless?

Here we may leave Dr. Douglas Mackenzie for a moment and consider Canon Hensley Henson. Dr. Mackenzie is not a blind apologist for traditional orthodoxy. Canon Hensley Henson is as

suspicious of traditionalism as Canon Cheyne is of the Old Testament text. What does Canon Henson say? In his volume of sermons, *The Value of the Bible* (6s.), just published by Messrs. Macmillan, he says, 'The New Testament, read in the light of honest criticism, justifies, so far as documents can justify, the apostolic doctrine of the sinlessness of Christ.' That will do for the present.

But there is another way of discovering whether Christ makes good His claims. The appeal is still to history. But now it is not to a single period in the history of the past, it is to the experience of those who have put His claims to the test in all the ages and generations of men since the Christian era began. It is to the experience of men who are alive unto this present. Professor Mackenzie says that this is the supreme test. He is not so suspicious of documentary evidence as Canon Hensley Henson. He is not so unsteady in his step as he walks through the history of the first century. But he holds that the experience of men and women is the supreme test of the claims of Jesus Christ. He says, 'We of the Christian Church ought deliberately and broadly and calmly to assert and reassert that this is the final and the supreme test.'

And this test stands. Jesus Christ, according to the claims which He made on earth, according to what the Germans have taught us to call the 'content of His self-consciousness,' is alive on earth to-day; is alive and active, producing conviction of sin, leading to reformation of life, the inner nourishment of weak wills, the inner cleansing of the fountains of life. It is history that gives us that. It is the history of the life of the men and women who, from the first century to the twentieth, have through Christ entered into conscious fellowship with God, and into the meaning of the apostle's question, How can they that have died to sin live any longer therein?

We have mentioned Canon Hensley Henson's new volume of sermons. Its most instructive

sermon is this very sermon on the sinlessness of Christ. As we have seen, Canon Henson asserts Christ's sinlessness. How does he reach it? Just as President Mackenzie reaches it, by an appeal to history. And his appeal is the double appeal—first to the documentary facts of the life of Christ, and next to the experience of Christians.

The value of Canon Henson's testimony lies in the appeal to experience. Who could be more suspicious of apostolic testimony? Who could affirm more unmovedly the facts of the religious consciousness? 'We,' he says, 'if we are Christians in fact as well as in name; we, not less than the writers of the New Testament, build our fabric of belief on the foundation of experience. Jesus Christ is to us, as to them, an Object of affection, and of the confidence which affection makes possible; we, as they, have carried to Him our secrets of trouble and shame, and we also have found that our trust was not misplaced. We have an interior certitude, phrase it how you will, that we have nothing to fear from the most searching criticism of the historical memorials of our Master's life; for our knowledge of Him has made us secure where His Character is in question.'

In his new volume of sermons—if we should call them sermons—entitled *Faith and Knowledge* (T. & T. Clark; 4s. 6d. net), to which reference has already been made, Mr. Inge is occasionally the master of a style in the use of which he seems to be unapproached by any theological writer of our day. It is a style which gives to a new thought not merely a clear and fitting expression, but leaves upon it a sense of artistic fearlessness. You know how the great Masters make you say, 'How did he dare to defy conventionalities?' Mr. Inge defies our conventionalities, not at all for the sake of defiance, but because the truth he seeks to express is higher.

We need not go further than the preface for illustration. We need not go further than the

title-page. For the title is not chosen at hazard, the order of words is not set down by chance. 'Faith and Knowledge,' says Mr. Inge, that is the true order; and there is nothing that the present generation needs recalling to more urgently than this, that Faith is first and Knowledge afterwards.

Is that not daring? The present generation is the generation of all the Sciences. To know is first, to know is last, to know is everything. What is its text?—'This is life eternal, to know.' You will find no other so frequently announced by the preachers of this generation.

And the philosophy of this generation has fallen into line with that. Its text is Lotze's dictum, 'We strive to know that we may learn to do.' Its title now is Pragmatism. Mr. Inge does not believe in Pragmatism. He disputes Lotze's dictum. First comes Faith, he says, and then Knowledge. Or, as the mystics put it, Let self-discipline precede, and enlightenment will follow.

What is Mr. Inge's advantage? He breaks down the idea that we must know all that can be known and then believe the rest. That is the idea of the men of this generation. And so they say there is the Natural and there is the Supernatural. You get at the Natural by Knowledge, at the Supernatural by Faith. Push the Supernatural back. Push it back ever further. Know all that can be known, and you will find that there is little Supernatural left.

Mr. Inge destroys that idea. If there is a distinction between the Natural and the Supernatural, the Supernatural comes first. It is truer to say, 'By faith gain all you can of the Supernatural, and the Natural will be yours. Seek first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness, and all other things will be added unto you. But there is no distinction between the Natural and the Supernatural, says Mr. Inge. And as he says it, we are in the presence of the highest daring of

theological art. Faith embraces the whole universe. In its immaturity it may need the crutch of the distinction between Natural and Supernatural. But as it goes on to know the Lord, it finds that the things which seemed Natural once are Supernatural now, and the Supernatural is in Him Natural.

'In the writer's opinion'—so Mr. Inge ends his preface, 'two things are now most necessary, if the Church is to take her proper place in the life and thought of the twentieth century. One is, that her teachers should steadily discourage the popular supernaturalistic dualism—the notion that God only begins where Nature leaves off, and works with a free hand only in the ever-narrowing gaps which Science has not yet filled up. And the other—a positive precept—is that many competent workers should devote themselves to a rigidly scientific study of the *normal* phenomena of religious experience.'

'Who is this that cometh from Edom, with dyed garments from Bozrah?' Our fathers answered the prophet's question by saying, It is the Lord Jesus Christ. And when the prophet asked further, 'Wherefore art thou red in thine apparel, and thy garments like him that treadeth in the winefat?' they answered again, It is because they are dyed with His own blood shed on Calvary.

The modern commentator is shocked. 'It was a serious misapprehension of the spirit of prophecy which led many of the Fathers [and practically all of our fathers] to apply the prophecy to the passion and death of Christ. Although certain phrases, detached from their context, may suggest that interpretation to a Christian reader, there can be no doubt that the scene depicted is a "drama of Divine vengeance" into which the idea of propitiation does not enter.' And the modern commentator is right. It was a serious misapprehension on our fathers' part. Is Christ not in it then? Yes, Christ is in it after all.

Edom and Israel were enemies of old. Edom is Esau and Israel is Jacob, and they strove ere they left the womb; they maintained their strife all the days of their existence. Then there came a day when the strife reached its climax. When Jerusalem was destroyed by Nebuchadrezzar, the Edomites took part in the destruction. They gathered their ancient enmity into one sweeping merciless blow, and when the city fell they raised a shout of exultation. The Israelites were carried captive. The Edomites watched them as they passed to the land of their captivity. They lined the way and mocked them as they went. Will Israel forgive it? You do not know Israel if you think so. Have you read the book of the prophet Obadiah? 'In the day that thou stoodest on the other side, in the day that strangers carried away his substance, and foreigners entered into his gates, and cast lots upon Jerusalem, even thou wast as one of them. . . . As thou hast done, it shall be done unto thee; thy dealing shall return upon thine own head.' Surely you have read the 137th Psalm—

Remember, O Lord, against the children of Edom
The day of Jerusalem;
Who said, Rase it, rase it,
Even to the foundation thereof.

Happy shall he be, that taketh and dasheth thy little
ones
Against the rock.

Surely you remember that terrible Psalm. Israel never forgot.

So one day Isaiah had a vision. Looking out from Jerusalem, he saw a conqueror return from the direction of Edom, from Bozrah the capital of the Edomites. He accosted him: 'Wherefore art thou red in thine apparel?' The answer is terrible in its strength, in its vindictiveness: 'I trod them in mine anger, and trampled them in my fury; and their life-blood is sprinkled upon my garments, and I have stained all my raiment.' Israel has had her revenge. The day of vengeance upon Edom has come. There is no mercy, there

is no escape. 'I poured out their life-blood on the earth.'

How did Isaiah know that Edom would suffer? He had a vision; you say. But what is a vision? Certainly the vision came before the fact. Isaiah saw the blood-stained conqueror return from Bozrah while the chief city of the Edomites was dwelling in insolent security. He had a vision. But what is a vision?

Isaiah knew that there is a righteous God in the earth. There were others in Israel besides Isaiah who knew that. What was it that separated Israel from the nations of the earth? It was the knowledge that there is a righteous God. Other nations knew that there were gods, and that it was possible to play off one god against another; other nations knew that righteousness had little to do with the gods or the gods with righteousness. Israel knew that there is one only living and true God, that He is the God of the whole earth, and that He doeth righteousness continually. All Israel knew it. But Isaiah knew it better than the rest of Israel did. It was Isaiah's absorbing victorious belief in a righteous God that gave him his vision. So there are three things in the Vision.

There is this first: That *there is revenge on earth for every wrong that has ever been done*. Why did Isaiah see the blood-stained conqueror come from Edom? Because Edom had exulted over Israel in the day of her calamity, and Isaiah knew that Israel would one day be amply avenged of that wrong. He knew it because there is a God in this earth that doeth righteously. Our modern poet knows it. 'God's in His heaven—All's right with the world!' You scoff at the modern poet; you scoff at him when you are smarting under your wrong. The creed of the optimist, you say; the purr of the well-to-do English citizen of the middle class! But Browning is right. You did not know that God is in His heaven and that every wrong would be amply avenged? Even

Isaiah knew that. Even the Psalmists of Israel knew that—

The Lord executeth righteous acts,
And judgments for all that are oppressed.
He made known His ways unto Moses,
His doings unto the children of Israel.

God has the power and exercises it. He never makes a mistake. He sees to it that every wrong is amply avenged.

What a discovery it is! What a revolution it makes in a man's life when he discovers it! God righteous judgment executes for all that are oppressed! Then, the wrong that I have suffered, I shall yet have vengeance for it? Yes, ample vengeance.

That is the first thing. The second thing is that *the revenge is obtained by the self-sacrifice of the wronged*. Isaiah did not know that. This is where our fathers made their mistake in interpreting Isaiah. They thought that Isaiah knew that the wrong was avenged by the person that suffered it. Ah no. There is progress in the doctrine of revenge. There is an advance over the position of Isaiah. It is to be admitted, however reluctantly, that the conqueror whom Isaiah saw return from Edom was stained, not with his own, but with the blood of the Edomites. Isaiah saw that there is revenge. How ample it is, he also saw. You never read the story of a more ample, a more awful revenge than this. But Isaiah did not see that the vengeance was obtained at the cost of the conqueror's own life-blood.

Why should we be afraid to say that Isaiah did not see this? Why should we be reluctant to allow some originality to Jesus? It is not to be denied that Isaiah had the sense of vicarious suffering. But that is not the same. No one knew till the Lord Jesus Christ came that God's method of obtaining vengeance on His enemies was to die for them. No one knew that that is the only way for men.

There cannot be another way. God Himself has told us so. For if there had been another way He certainly would not have taken this way. But history has told us also. Was there ever revenge got by making the guilty suffer? Were the ancient clan-feuds ended so? We may not have learned the lesson fully yet. It is so great a lesson to learn, there is no greater or more blessed lesson to be learned on earth. Not one of us may have learned the lesson fully yet. But we are learning it. Slowly but surely even as nations we are learning it. There was not the wildest Maf-ficker among us who did not feel that it would have been nobler for Lord Roberts that day he telegraphed the news of Cronje's surrender, if he had not reminded us that it was the anniversary of Majuba.

So there are these two things in it. First, that there is revenge on earth for every wrong; and next, that the vengeance is obtained by the self-sacrifice of the person who has been wronged. The third thing is the *loneliness of the avenger*.

The loneliness of the avenger is a prominent matter in Isaiah's vision. The commentators notice that. 'The keynote of the piece,' says Professor George Adam Smith, 'is the loneliness of the Hero.' And all Christendom has noticed it. Where are the words that have carried more sorrow to the Christian heart than these: 'I have trodden the wine-press alone?' The commentators say that Christendom has been mistaken. The solitary Avenger is not the Lamb of Calvary, it is Jehovah the God of Israel, obtaining Divine vengeance for His chosen people. But the heart of Christendom has not been wholly wrong. The Avenger of guilty man must also tread the wine-press alone. And even the man who has suffered wrong must go out and obtain his revenge alone. Of the people there can be none with him.

Why has the Avenger to go out alone? Because Israel now is God and Edom is guilty man. Who can stand out among his fellows and reconcile

them to God? The wronged must be his own Avenger, and it is always, 'Gainst thee, thee only have I sinned.' If God has suffered the wrong, none but God can obtain revenge for it. And it is so between man and man. In this also we are crucified with Christ. No one can pay the price that will reconcile to thee the man that has done thee wrong. Thou too must tread the wine-press alone. Thou must see of the travail of thy soul and be satisfied. So when thou bringest thy gift to the altar, and there rememberest that *thou hast aught against thy brother*, leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way, first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift.

But we have not touched the heart of the matter yet. What is this loneliness? It is the loneliness of the soul that craves for sympathy. Did you think that the loneliness of the Conqueror consisted simply in His solitary grandeur? 'A striking majestic figure!' We know the commentators' commonplaces. What is a striking majestic solitary figure to us? It is a God who craves for human sympathy, for human love, we need.

What is the wrong that we had done Him? We had simply withheld our love from Him. We had done Him, we could do Him, no other wrong

than that. He came to get back our love. He came to Calvary for no other end than that. And of course He came alone. Until He suffers and in suffering has His revenge upon us; until by His solitary sacrifice He wins back our love, He cannot but be alone. But He is not proud of His loneliness. Ah, God forbid. When the commentators tell us that His cry, 'I have trodden the wine-press alone,' is a proud boast, how utterly are the commentators astray. Listen to Him at the Supper: 'I will not drink of the fruit of this vine until I drink it new with you in My Father's Kingdom,' and yet 'with desire have I desired to eat this Passover with you before I suffer.' Watch Him in the garden. He is only a stone's-throw away from them, but He must be alone. He must be alone, and yet He returns to them, returns to them again and again, and gently chides them, 'What, could ye not watch with Me one hour?'

He craves for sympathy, for the love of men. There was nothing else that brought Him to the Cross. Yet He must be alone. Until He wins the love He must be alone. We have not yet sounded the depth of distress in the words of Edom's Conqueror, 'I have trodden the wine-press alone.' But the Christian heart has been right. There is no sorrow like unto this sorrow.

The New Oxyrhynchus Sayings.

A TENTATIVE INTERPRETATION.¹

BY THE REV. H. B. SWETE, D.D., LITT.D., REGIUS PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY
IN THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE.

In July 1897 I had the pleasure of lecturing in this place upon a series of sayings of our Lord which had been discovered on the site of Oxyrhynchus by Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt.² The indefatigable zeal of these two Oxford scholars has now brought to light a second fragment, belonging

apparently to the same collection though not to the same papyrus, which adds five or six new sayings to the seven previously given to the world. Through the courtesy of the discoverers, a proof of the new sayings, with their comments upon them, has been in my possession since April, and some of my spare time has been agreeably spent in an endeavour to interpret the treasure. The result, such as it is, is printed overleaf.

¹ A lecture delivered at the Divinity School, Cambridge, on 7th July 1904.

² See THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, viii. pp. 544 ff., 568.

Reconstruction in the present instance is not only hazardous, but for the most part impracticable. The earlier discovery lent itself with comparative

new fragment, on the other hand, has been torn or cracked down the middle, and the right-hand side has disappeared; of the forty-two lines which

^a Jo. iv. 37, Apoc. xix. 9, xxi. 5, xxi. 6.

^b Rom. xiv. 9, Apoc. i. 18, ii. 8; cf. Jo. xi. 16, xx. 24 ff.

^c Jo. xx. 2, 18, 20, xxi. 7, 12.

^d Jo. xii. 4, 7, xviii. 37, xix. 13.

^e Ps. lii (liii). 2.

^f Mc. i. 27, x. 24, 32

^g Clem. *strom.* ii. 9, 45, v. 14, 97.

^h Clem. *strom.* vii. 2, 9; so *ἐλκεύει* in Cant. i. 4, Jer. xxxviii, (xxxix). 2, Jo. vi. 44, xii. 32.

ⁱ Absolutely, as in Mt. xiii. 38, xxiv. 14, Acts xx. 25.

^j Lc. xvii. 21.

^k 2 Cor. vi. 18.

See Kattenbusch, *das apost. Symbol* ii. p. 520 ff.

^l Cf. Mt. v. 14, Heb. xii. 22.

^m Plat. *Phaed.* 84 c; *ἀνεύει*, Acts ix. 38.

ⁿ Acts i. 7.

^o Mc. x. 31.

^p Mt. vii. 14.

^q Mt. x. 26, Lc. viii. 17.

^r Mt. ii. 8, x. 11; constr., Jo. xxi. 12.

^s The order of Mt. vi. 1—18 reversed.

^t Gal. iv. 10.

^u Mt. v. 12 etc., x. 42; 2 Jo. 8; for the future after βλ. μή see Col. ii. 8, Heb. iii. 12.

^v Jo. i. 17, etc.

^w Jo. xii. 32, xvi. 23, xx. 23.

^x Mc. iv. 11, Col. i. 26.

Cf. Clem. *strom.* v. 10. 64 *μυστήριον ἐμὸν*

ἐμοὶ καὶ τοῖς υἱοῖς τοῦ οἴκου μου.

Οὗτοι οἱ¹ λόγοι οἱ [ἀληθινοὶ^a οὓς ἐλά^b]λησεν Ἰησοῦς ὁ ζῶν κ[ἀλ ἀποθανῶν^b Ἰουδα τῷ] | καὶ Θωμᾶ. καὶ εἶπεν [αὐτῷ ὁ κύριος^c "Οστις] | ἂν τῶν λόγων τούτ[ων ἀκούσῃ^d, θανάτου] | οὐ μὴ γενύσῃται.

[Λέγει Ἰησοῦς] | Μὴ παυσάσθω ὁ ζῇ[τῶν τὸν πατέρα^e ἕως ἂν] | εὖρῃ, καὶ ὅταν εὖρῃ [θαμβείσθω^f, καὶ θαμ]βηθεὶς βασιλεύσει^g, κα[ὶ βασιλεύσας ἀναπα]||ήσεται^h.

Λέγει Ἰησοῦς Τίνες εἰσὶν] | οἱ ἔλκοντες^h ὑμᾶς³ [πρὸς τὴν βασιλείανⁱ;] | ἡ βασιλεία ἐν οὐρα[νῷ. οἱ δὲ ἐπὶ γῆς καὶ] | τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρ[ανοῦ καὶ πᾶν κτίσμα ὅ]τι ὑπὸ τὴν γῆν ἐστ[ὶν καὶ ἐν τῷ ἄδῃ καὶ] | οἱ ἰχθυεὶς τῆς θαλά[σσης, οὗτοί οἱ ἔλκον]τες ὑμᾶς, καὶ ἡ βασ[ιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν] | ἐντὸς^j ὑμῶν [ἐ]στ[ί]ν, καὶ ὅστις ἂν ἑαυτὸν] | γνῶ ταύτην εὐρή[σῃ. ἐὰν γὰρ ἀληθῶς] | ἑαυτοὺς γνώσεσθε^k, [υἱοὶ καὶ θυγατέρες] | ἐστὲ ὑμεῖς⁵ τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ π[αντοκράτορος^k, καὶ] | γνώσεσθε⁶ ἑαυτοὺς ἐν[τὸς τῆς πόλεως ὄντας]. | καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐστὲ ἡ πτ[όλις]^l.

Λέγει Ἰησοῦς | Οὐκ ἀποκνήσει^m ἄνθ[ρωπος περὶ τῶν καὶ]||ρῶνⁿ ἐπερωτῆσαι⁷ πα[ρρησιαζόμενος, λη]ρῶν περὶ τοῦ τόπου τῆ[ς δόξης. ὑμεῖς δὲ σιωπῇ]σετε⁸ ὅτι⁹ πολλοὶ ἔσονται π[ρῶτοι ἔσχατοι καὶ] | οἱ ἔσχατοι πρῶτοι⁹, καὶ [ὀλίγοι εὐρήσου]||σιν^p.

Λέγει Ἰησοῦς [Πᾶν τὸ μὴ ἔμπροσ]θεν τῆς ὀψεὸς σου καὶ [τὸ κεκρυμμένον] | ἀπὸ σου ἀποκαλυφθήσεται⁹. οὐ γάρ ἐσ]τιν κρυπτόν ὃ ο[ὐ φανερόν γενήσεται].^q | καὶ τεθαμμένον¹⁰ ὃ ο[ὐκ ἐγερθήσεται].

[Ἐξ]ετάζουσιν^r αὐτὸν ο[ὐ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ] | λέγουσιν Πῶς νηστεύ[σωμεν; καὶ πῶς προσευξώ]μεθα; καὶ πῶς [ἐλεημοσύνην ποιή]σωμεν^s; καὶ τί παρατηρησ[ώμεθα^t τῶν τοιούτων]; λέγει Ἰησοῦς [Βλέπετε μὴ τὸν μισ]θὸν ἀπολ[εῖτε^u. μὴ ποιεῖτε μηδὲν εἰ μὴ] | τὰ τ[ῆς ἀληθείας^x ἂν^v γὰρ ποιῇτε ταῦτα, γνώ]σεσθε μυστήριον^v ἀποκεκρ[υμμένον^z. λέγω ὑμῖν Μα]κάρι[ός] ἐστ[ὶν¹² ὃς ἂν...

¹ ΟΙΤΟΙΟΙΟΙ

² ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥCH

³ ΗΜΑΣ

⁴ ΓΝΩΣΕCΘΑΙ

⁵ ΓΜΕΙC *suprascr.*

⁶ ΓΝΩCΘΕ

⁷ ΕΠΕΡΩΤΗCΕ

⁸ ΟΤΙ *suprascr.*

⁹ ΑΠΟΚΑΛΥΦΗCΕΤ..

¹⁰ ΘΕΘΑΜΜΕΝΟΝ

¹¹ ΕΙΤΑΙ

¹² Line 41 shews ω ect under oc ect,

and line 42 IN under ect

ease to conjectural restoration; two only of the seven sayings were seriously damaged, and with very few exceptions both the beginnings and the endings of the lines had been preserved. The

it contained, every one has lost its ending, while the last eleven are defective also at the beginning. Thus even the average length of the lines can only be conjectured; but, judging from the four or

five which can be restored with some degree of confidence, the average number of letters may well have been twenty-nine or thirty, and the normal length twelve syllables or that of an iambic trimeter, one of the measures, as Dr. Rendel Harris¹ has shown, which professional scribes followed in dividing their matter into *stichi*. This probability must be borne in mind by the interpreter; no filling up of the lacunæ is admissible which makes any line considerably exceed twelve syllables or thirty letters. But the guidance thus afforded does not, of course, guarantee any security that the lacunæ have been rightly filled. I offer my attempt not as even a provisional restoration, but merely as an interpretation suggested by the letters which survive. Let me add that I have freely used the helps afforded by the editors and the German and English scholars whom they have consulted. It will be unnecessary to acknowledge these debts in detail, because I may assume that the fourth volume of the *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, or at least the pamphlet which contains the new sayings,² is in the hands of everyone who is here to-day.

The first four lines and a half of the new papyrus are introductory. The fragment of 1897 began in the middle of a saying; the fragment of 1904 begins with the opening words of the collection, or of one of its books or sections. We now know that in the third century there existed a collection of Λόγοι Ἰησοῦ which was in circulation at Oxyrhynchus and probably elsewhere in the valley of the Nile. The sayings were not simply jotted down in the note-book of a private collector, but were prepared for publication. Perhaps this might have been inferred from the book-form and the uncial script of the earlier fragment, but the formal introduction which has now been found places the fact beyond reasonable doubt.

'These (the compiler begins) are the true sayings which Jesus who liveth and was dead spake to Judas Thomas.'

Even the first sentence presents difficulties. Οἱ τοῖτοι οἱ λόγοι is intolerable, and the editors propose to delete the first article; I cannot but think that οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι, which they mention but dismiss, is a more probable correction. After λόγοι οἱ it is natural to supply ἀληθινοί, and after ὁ ζῶν the words καὶ ἀποθανών are suggested by more than

one passage in the New Testament, while ὁ ζῶν κύριος is an unusual if not unprecedented combination. But the chief problem of the sentence lies in the lacuna which precedes Θωμά. Here I gladly accept Professor Lake's brilliant conjecture, Ἰούδα τῷ καὶ Θωμά. 'Judas Thomas,' it will be remembered, is read by the Curetonian Syriac in Jn 14²², and the form Ἰούδας ὁ καὶ Θωμάς occurs in the *Acts of Thomas* (§ 11), for which Mr. Burkitt has claimed a Syriac original,³ and in the Syriac document quoted in a Greek translation by Eusebius, *H.E.* i. 13. I will leave it to others to consider whether this conjecture is consistent with the Egyptian origin or circulation of the sayings.

The prologue proceeds: 'And the Lord said to him, Whosoever shall hearken to these sayings, he shall in nowise taste of death.'

This is not one of the λόγοι, but a preliminary saying, perhaps adapted from Jn 8⁵¹, Ἐάν τις τὸν ἐμὸν λόγον τηρήσῃ θάνατον οὐ μὴ θεωρήσῃ (or, as the words are recast in the next verse, οὐ μὴ γεύσῃται θανάτου) εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. Ἀκούειν λόγον is but another expression for τηρεῖν λόγον, just as γεύσθαι θανάτου is another expression for θάνατον θεωρεῖν. I see no improbability in the supposition that the second century compiler has modified the words of a canonical Gospel to suit his purpose, and represented them as addressed in this form to St. Thomas. That he has gone to the Fourth Gospel for his text is a suggestive circumstance; and accords with other indications which the fragment shows of acquaintance with the Johannine books.

The brief prologue is followed by the first saying: 'Jesus saith, Let not him who seeks the Father cease until he find Him; and having found Him, let him be amazed; and being amazed he shall reign, and reigning shall rest.'

The substance of this saying has long been familiar to us through its use by Clement of Alexandria, who (*Strom.* v. 4, § 97) quotes it in the form Οὐ παύσεται ὁ ζητῶν ἕως ἂν εὕρῃ, εὕρων δὲ θαμβηθήσεται, θαμβηθεὶς δὲ βασιλεύσει, βασιλεύσας δὲ ἐπαναπαύσεται. In an earlier book of the *Stromateis* (ii. 9, § 45) he attributes what is apparently part of the same saying to the Gospel according to the Hebrews: κὰν τῷ καθ' Ἑβραίου εὐαγγελίῳ, 'Ὁ θυμώσας βασιλεύσει, γέγραπται, 'καὶ ὁ

¹ *Stichometry*, p. 15 ff.

² *New Sayings of Jesus*, etc. London: Froude. Price 1s.

³ *Journal of Theological Studies*, p. 280 ff.

βασιλείας ἀναπαύσεται.' The newly discovered form agrees in the main with Clement's longer quotation, but is slightly fuller; after ζητῶν there is a gap of thirteen or fourteen letters, of which eight or nine were probably occupied by the object of search. As the editors observe, τὴν βασιλείαν is too long; they suggest τὴν ζήην, but perhaps τὸν θεόν is to be preferred, or, better still, τὸν πατέρα, for which there is just room. In the next line the exigencies of the space seem to require θαμβεῖσθω rather than θαμβηθήσεται, and the imperative perhaps agrees better with the foregoing παυσάσθω. Clement, who begins with παύσεται, has kept to the future throughout.

What is theθάμβος which is enjoined on those who seek and find God? If we may judge from the New Testament use ofθάμβος, θαμβεῖσθαι, ἐκθαμβεῖσθαι, ἐκθαμβος, this group of words indicates the sudden sensation akin on the one hand to fear (Mk 10²⁴ 14²⁹), and on the other to ecstasy (Ac 3¹⁰) which attends the unexpected, especially when it belongs to the region of the supernatural or the Divine. Thus in the present saying θαμβεῖσθω indicates with precision the rush of mingled fear and joy which ought to follow the great εὕρηκα of life, the discovery of God.

The second saying is new, and of the deepest interest, but so badly mutilated that more than one line of interpretation is possible. I offer that which on the whole I prefer.

'Jesus saith, Who are they that draw you (MS., us) to the kingdom? The kingdom is in heaven; but they that are on earth and the birds of the heaven and every creature that is under the earth and in Hades and the fishes of the sea, these are they that draw you to it. And the kingdom of heaven is within you, and whosoever shall know himself shall find it; for if ye shall truly know yourselves, ye are the sons and daughters of the Father Almighty, and ye shall know yourselves to be in the city of God, and ye are the city.'

The key to the general meaning lies in οἱ ἔλκοντες. ἔλκειν occurs but twice in the New Testament (Ac 21³⁰, Ja 2⁶), and both times in the sense of dragging a resisting body. But it is patient of another use; it may equally well describe the attractive or magnetic power which draws the soul towards a person or a goal. In this sense, it is true, ἔλκειν seems to be more usual, cf. e.g. Jn 6⁴⁴ ἐὰν μὴ ὁ πατήρ . . . ἐλκύσῃ αὐτόν,

id. 12³² πάντας ἐλκύσω πρὸς ἐμαντόν. But ἔλκειν, 'to draw,' is well attested; thus in 4 Mac 14¹³ a mother's στοργή is represented as ἔλκουσα πάντα πρὸς τὴν τῶν σπλάγχνων συνπάθειαν, and Clement (*Strom.* vii. 2, § 9) speaks of men as τῷ ἀγίῳ πνεύματι ἐλκόμενοι. But if οἱ ἔλκοντες ὑμᾶς in our saying are 'they who attract you,' how shall we fill up the lacuna that follows? Does the Speaker refer to the forces which attract men to the world, or to those which attract them to God? Shall we proceed πρὸς τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς (or τὰ ἐπίγεια), or πρὸς τὴν βασιλείαν? At first sight the broken lights of the next few lines seem to direct us to the former, in which case the sense would be: 'the kingdom is in heaven, but you are drawn to the present world by the visible creation about you'—a commonplace with every preacher. But when the words are studied more closely, a subtler and more suggestive thought emerges: 'the kingdom is in heaven, it is spiritual and invisible and belongs to another order; yet the visible creation, the common objects of outward life, rightly used and understood, have the power of directing you to God and things above; or, as St. Paul (Ro 1²⁰) expresses the same truth: τὰ ἀόρατα αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου τοῖς ποιήμασιν νοούμενα καθοράται, ἣ τε αἰδὶος αὐτοῦ δύναμις καὶ θεότης. The physical creation ought to be an ally and not an adversary to the soul that strives to attain the kingdom of God—a doctrine never more needful than in our own age.

Furthermore, the Speaker continues, the kingdom of God is not only in heaven. It is within men, and all that tends to self-knowledge attracts them to it. 'Know yourselves aright, and you are the children of God; you belong to the City of God, nay, you yourselves constitute that City.'

The study of Nature, the study of Man, are forces which in loyal disciples make for righteousness, drawing them to the highest and best things, and not, as in others, distracting attention from them.

But if this view of the second saying is accepted, opinions will differ as to the details. The two most doubtful points seem to me to be the insertion of τοῦ παντοκράτορος after τοῦ πατρός and the use of πόλις in the last two lines. 'Ο πατήρ ὁ παντοκράτωρ is a title of God which, though common in Christian writings from the second century onwards, has no parallel in the New Testament, where παντοκράτωρ is used, as in the LXX, only in connexion with Κύριος or ὁ Θεός.

Yet the phrase *υἱοὶ καὶ θυγατέρες τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ παντοκράτορος* finds some justification in St. Paul's version of more than one Old Testament promise (2 Co 6¹⁸ *ἔσομαι ὑμῖν εἰς πατέρα καὶ ὑμεῖς ἔσεσθέ μοι εἰς υἱοὺς καὶ θυγατέρας, λέγει Κύριος παντοκράτωρ*). If it is to be accepted in our saying, I fear it must be regarded as an echo of St. Paul's words which has found its way into the saying in the course of transmission—a not very satisfactory admission, but one which I am in fairness bound to make. *Ὑμεῖς ἐστὲ ἡ πόλις*, which is due to Professor Blass, presents a thought which is not unknown to the Gospels or to the first series of Oxyrhynchus sayings. It is latent in St. Matthew's *πόλις ἐπάνω ὄρους κειμένη*, and in the *πόλις οἰκοδομημένη ἐπ' ἄκρου ὄρους ὑψηλοῦ* of the sixth so-called 'logion.' Even the form is after the manner of our Lord's teaching; as He said to His disciples, *Ὑμεῖς ἐστὲ τὸ ἅλας τῆς γῆς* and *Ὑμεῖς ἐστὲ τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου*, so conceivably He might have said, *Ὑμεῖς ἐστὲ ἡ πόλις τοῦ Θεοῦ*. Yet, as the words stand in the saying before us, they are abrupt and strange, and the archaic spelling of *πόλις* increases our doubt.

The third saying is not less difficult to reconstruct.

'Jesus saith, A man will not hesitate to inquire boldly about the seasons, prating of the place of glory. But ye shall hold your peace; for many that are first shall be last, and the last first, and few shall find it.'

So on the whole I venture to interpret. The general sense is fixed by the last two lines, which may be almost certainly restored, *ὅτι πολλοὶ ἔσονται πρῶτοι ἔσχατοι καὶ οἱ ἔσχατοι πρῶτοι*—the exact words, as the editors remark, of Mk 10³¹ according to the reading of the best MSS. That the saying ends thus shows that the Speaker is discouraging undue confidence in reference to the final award; and in view of this I propose to adopt some such ending as *καὶ ὀλίγοι εὐρήσουσιν*, rather than the editors' *καὶ ζῶν ἁγίων ἐξουσιν*, which does not seem to be quite relevant to the purpose of the preceding words. But it is the first half of the sentence which gives the interpreter serious trouble. All would be straightforward if we could ignore the *lacunæ* and read simply *Οὐκ ἀποκνήσει ἄνθρωπος ἐπερωτῆσαι περὶ τοῦ τόπου*. But on either side of the infinitive there is a gap of half a line which must be filled, and to add to our difficulty, each gap is followed by the letters *ρων* while the second

begins with the letters *πα*. Under these conditions our choice of words is very limited. *Περὶ τῶν καιρῶν* is suggested by such passages as Mk 13³³ *οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτε ὁ καιρὸς ἐστίν*, and Ac 1⁷ *οὐχ ὑμῶν γινῶναι χρόνους· ἢ καιροὺς*. If *ληρεῖν* is not a New Testament word, yet *λῆρος* occurs in Lk 24¹¹. But I set no store by either of these conjectures, and use them merely as stopgaps, which may be displaced as soon as something better has been found. For *ὁ τόπος τῆς δόξης* I can quote no authority,¹ but *ὁ τόπος* is illustrated by Jn 14² *πορεύομαι εἰτοιμάσαι τόπον ὑμῖν*, and Ac 1²⁵ *πορεύθηναι εἰς τὸν τόπον τὸν ἴδιον*; and *τῆς δόξης* by Jn 17²² *τὴν δόξαν ἣν δέδωκάς μοι δέδωκα αὐτοῖς*.

The fourth saying has been restored by Dr. Grenfell and Dr. Hunt with complete success.

'Jesus saith, Everything that is not before thy face and that which is hidden from thee shall be revealed; for there is nothing hidden which shall not be made manifest, or buried which shall not be raised.'

Like more than one of the former group of Oxyrhynchus sayings, this saying is closely akin to one in the canonical Gospels. It reminds us at once of Mt 10²⁶ *οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐστὶν κεκαλυμμένον ὃ οὐκ ἀποκαλυφθήσεται, καὶ κρυπτόν ὃ οὐ γνωσθήσεται*, and Lk 8¹⁷ *οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶν κρυπτόν ὃ οὐ φανερόν γενήσεται οὐδὲ ἀπόκρυφον ὃ οὐ μὴ γνωσθῇ καὶ εἰς φανερόν ἔλθῃ*. Our saying blends elements which are to be found in each of these. But it has also features of its own. *Πᾶν τὸ μὴ ἔμπροσθεν τῆς ὀψεως σου* is interesting for its use of the Johannine word *ὄψις*; and the ending *οὐ γὰρ ἐστίν . . . τεθαμμένον ὃ οὐκ ἐγερθήσεται* presents a striking metaphor to which the Gospels offer no parallel. Does it refer to the doctrine of the Resurrection? is the thought that of Jn 5²⁸ *πάντες οἱ ἐν τοῖς μνημείοις . . . ἐκπορεύονται*? The Resurrection may be in the background of the words, but if they were spoken during the Ministry, I incline to the belief that they refer, as the Synoptic sayings usually do, to one of the incidents of Galilean life. It was no uncommon thing for treasure to be buried in the ground for the sake of security; we recall Mt 13⁴⁴ *ὁμοία ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν θησαυρῷ κεκρυμμένῳ ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ*. From time to time in northern Palestine the spade of the labourer turns up such a hoard, and I have in my possession a tetradrachm which

¹ A colleague reminds me that I have overlooked Clement of Rome's *τὸν ὀφειλόμενον τόπον τῆς δόξης*.

was found buried somewhere in the Lebanon some five and thirty years ago. 'Nothing is buried which shall not be raised,' acquires a new meaning in this light; buried silver or gold may escape discovery to the end of time, but character, life, truth, however long concealed, must in the end come to the surface and fulfil their destiny.

We have now reached the last of these sayings. It has suffered more severely than the rest, but enough remains to excite the greatest interest.

'His disciples enquire of Him and say, How are we to fast? and how are we to pray? and how are we to give alms? and of such duties what are we to observe? Jesus saith, See that ye lose not your reward. Do nothing save the things that belong to the truth, for if ye do these, ye shall know a hidden mystery. I say unto you, Blessed is the man who . . .'

This saying takes rank with the second in point of originality and importance. It is an answer to a question which happily has been fairly well preserved. The question seems to have arisen out of some instruction upon almsgiving, prayer, and fasting, similar to that which we find in the Sermon on the Mount, if not identical with it. We can imagine the circumstances. After the crowd had dispersed and our Lord was again alone with the Twelve, one or more of His disciples—Thomas, as the prologue suggests, or more probably Peter, perhaps in company with Andrew and the two sons of Zebedee (Mk 13¹⁴)—appealed to Him for more definite teaching on the three great acts of righteousness to which He had referred. The Pharisaic scribes had laid down definite rules for the discharge of these duties, and they looked to their Master for similar guidance. The strong word *ἐξετάζειν*, used in this sense only in Jn 20¹², indicates a desire to press their suit unduly, to examine, cross-question, and almost to catechise the Master on these matters, and force Him to prescribe a system of nicely-balanced regulations. How, *i.e.* after what manner, were His disciples to fulfil their obligations? The motive which prompted their demand is shown by the use of *παρρησιάζειν*; the Twelve were still under the influence of the Pharisaism which had been the religious teacher of their youth, and they not unnaturally sought to foist the spirit of legalism into the new teaching. We are reminded of St. Paul's words to the Galatians, 4¹⁰ *ἡμέρας παρρησιάζε*

καὶ μῆνας καὶ καιροὺς καὶ ἐνιαυτοὺς φοβοῦμαι ὑμᾶς, μὴ πὼς εἰκῇ κεκοπίακα εἰς ὑμᾶς.

If the question has been rightly interpreted, the general sense of the answer may be conjectured. In such a demand the Master would discover a temper the very opposite of that which He laboured to produce. Those who could make it had failed to grasp the first lessons of the kingdom of God. To use St. Paul's later phraseology, they looked to be justified by works of law, and not by a righteousness based upon the principle of faith. Against such a perversion of His teaching the Lord would assuredly have made a stand. But in what words? Along what line of thought would He have carried His questioners to a better understanding of His position? The keynote of His answer is struck by *τῆς ἀληθείας*, which survives to show that though the question may have arisen out of the Sermon on the Mount, the Lord's reply was in the terms of the Johannine teaching. To the bare performance of certain prescribed acts He opposed the doing of the Truth, which both the Fourth Gospel (3²¹) and the First Epistle of St. John (1⁶) represent as the first condition of life in Christ. No mere acts of fasting, prayer, and almsgiving, no formal observance of external duties, could secure the Divine reward, which depends on the assimilation and fulfilment of the Truth itself. The next line seems to describe the results of a life regulated by this principle, but we catch no more than a broken echo in which the word 'hidden' has a place. Professor Lake suggests, 'and ye shall eat the hidden manna,' and there is much to be said for this; like the reference to 'the Truth,' it is Johannine, coming directly from the Apocalypse, a book which, as we know from the Letter of the Churches of Vienne and Lyons, was highly prized by some Christian communities in the second century. But there is no obvious connexion between 'doing the truth' and 'eating the manna'; in the message to the Church at Pergamum the promise of the manna is apposite; it is a solatium for the loss of the *εἰδωλόθυτα*, a heavenly banquet reserved for those who refused the dainties and the social enjoyments of the pagan guild-feasts. No such sequence of thought is possible here. I prefer therefore to read *γνώσεσθε μυστήριον ἀποκεκρυμμένον*. For *μυστήριον* there is Synoptic authority (Mk 4¹¹ = Mt 13⁴ = Lk 8¹⁰), while the exact phrase *μυστ. ἀποκεκρυμμένον* occurs twice in the Pauline Epistles (Eph 3⁹, Col 1²⁶). It is true that in these passages

the article is used, but in a saying which, if genuine, presumably belongs to an early stage of the Galilean ministry, the anarthrous *μυστήριον ἀποκεκρυμμένον* is quite appropriate. The connexion between the Truth and a yet hidden mystery is not hard to trace. To do the Truth, to grasp and live the great principles of the gospel, is to win an entrance into that which is yet secret but will presently be revealed, the higher life behind the veil of sense.

In these remarks I have not concealed my impression that the new sayings are substantially genuine. That they have assumed their present form under the influence of the canonical Gospels, possibly also of the Apocalypse and certain of the Pauline Epistles, is not altogether incredible, even if we assent to the judgment of the editors that the compilation is not later than the middle of the second century. But, admitting the presence of canonical elements, there remains a large residuum which is at once new and after the manner of our Lord's earlier teaching. This is especially apparent in the second and fifth sayings, which it is difficult to regard as the creation of subapostolic times. 'The kingdom of God is in heaven, but it is also within you; all nature, your own nature, rightly interpreted, are magnets which attract you to God.' 'Principles of action are to be considered rather than formal acts; the Truth itself is the sufficient guide of life, and to follow it here is the one condition of being admitted to the fuller knowledge of the vision of God.' Are these thoughts such as could have had their origin in Christian circles, Catholic or heretical, within the sixty years which followed the death of St. John?

But if we allow the claim of the compiler that these sayings are in their substance *λόγοι Ἰησοῦ*, from what source or sources shall we suppose him to have derived his treasure? The editors have discussed this point at length, and I will not repeat what they have written except so far as it is necessary to do so for the purpose of making my meaning clear.

We have seen that a part of the first saying is quoted by Clement of Alexandria in a somewhat different form as from the Gospel according to the Hebrews. Dr. Grenfell and Dr. Hunt anticipate the inference that the other sayings are from the same Gospel, and, as it appears to me, they successfully dispose of it. It is not even certain that the first

saying was taken as it stands from that Gospel; it agrees more nearly with Clement's second quotation, which is anonymous; indeed, the agreement is so close that Clement may have taken his quotation from this very collection of which fragments have been found at Oxyrhynchus. More importance may be attached to the introductory question which precedes the fifth of the present sayings. It has the appearance of being taken from some narrative of the Ministry, where the Lord's answer would naturally be prefaced by a reference to the occasion which called it forth. It may be argued that the compiler has simply transcribed the passage, changing the *ὁ δὲ ἔφη* or *ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν* of the narrator into his usual formula, *Ἰησοῦς λέγει*. There is a similar instance of an answer preceded by a question in the homily known as the Second Epistle of Clement of Rome (2 Co 12 ἐπερωτηθεὶς γὰρ αὐτὸς ὁ κύριος ὑπὸ τινος πότε ἦξει αὐτοῦ ἡ βασιλεία, εἶπεν κ.τ.λ.), which Lightfoot believed to have been taken from the Gospel according to the Egyptians. On the other hand, it is conceivable that an agraphon might have carried with it the question which it answered when (as in the present case) the answer would not have been intelligible apart from the question.

Thus, while it is possible that certain of the sayings were excerpted from non-canonical Gospels, there is no convincing evidence that this was so; it is open to us to believe that the compiler was indebted wholly or chiefly to the floating traditions of the second century—traditions based on the recollections of those who had heard the Lord, or who, like Papias, had made it their business to inquire from survivors of the first generation what the apostles and other disciples had said about Him.

There remains the question how we are to understand the compiler's claim that the sayings were addressed to St. Thomas. Dr. Grenfell and Dr. Hunt regard the short preface with which the new fragment begins as introductory to the whole collection. I venture to suggest that it opens a fresh book or section, which, for whatever reason, the compiler has seen fit to connect with the Apostle Thomas. Possibly the whole collection was entitled *Λόγοι Ἰησοῦ πρὸς τοὺς δώδεκα*, and the name of one of the Twelve was associated with each section. Such an arrangement would be a comparatively innocent example of the tendency which led a second-century writer

to entitle his Church Order *Διδαχὴ Κυρίου διὰ τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων τοῖς ἔθνεσιν*, or which has given us Gospels of Thomas, Peter, James, and the like. If it be asked why these particular sayings were allocated to Thomas, the true answer will probably be that the distribution of the sayings among the several apostles was largely a matter of the compiler's convenience. In some cases, of course, he may have been guided by tradition, and in others by the characters of the sayings. It is not difficult to imagine the first and perhaps the second of these sayings as actually addressed to the Thomas of the Fourth Gospel. But no special

aptitude to St. Thomas can be discovered in the third and fourth, while the fifth, by the very terms in which it is introduced, belongs to the disciples as a body. Thus the arrangement which has assigned these sayings to St. Thomas must be regarded as chiefly arbitrary; it illustrates a fashion of the age, but has little further significance. The sayings must be judged severally, each on its own merits, without regard to the order in which they stand or their supposed connexion with a particular apostle. So judged, they will be found, I venture to think, not wholly unworthy of the Supreme Teacher of mankind.

Love's Offering.

Before Communion.

BY THE REV. W. M. RANKIN, B.D., GLASGOW.

'So they made him a supper there.'—John xii. 2.

THERE are three incidents in this chapter that show the interest roused by the personality of Jesus, and that allow us to gauge the depth and extent of the impression produced by Him. The anointing by Mary (the incident we go on to consider) is a proof of the love felt by His intimate friends for the Master. The triumphal entry into the city shows the enthusiasm that stirred the popular mind. And the influence on the outside world is expressed in the desire of the Greeks to see Jesus.

1. What was the occasion of this Supper?

It was a tribute to Christ by His friends, a mark of the affection and esteem with which He was regarded by them. The Evangelist John points out the growing hatred that fell on Christ, but the devotion He inspired in His followers is recorded with equal care. Christ does not leave men neutral and colourless. We come to be *for* Him or *against* Him.

The feast took place at Bethany—'so they made him a supper there.' Mark (chap. 14) tells us it took place in the house of Simon the leper. Perhaps he had been healed by Christ, and was taking occasion to express his gratitude to his Healer. Or, possibly, this was a feast in which some of the village folk wished to signalize their appreciation of Christ, and, in particular, their

wondering regard and gratitude for the reappearance among them of their friend Lazarus, whom Jesus had just before raised from the dead. In that case, never were the freedom of a city and the banquet that accompanies the honour bestowed more worthily. When the Saviour has done some signal act of goodness and restoration, don't fail to show your gratitude. All worship should be eucharistic or laden with thanksgiving. Jesus on an occasion like this cannot be too highly honoured by us. 'Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power and riches and wisdom and honour and glory and blessing!' (Rev 5¹²).

2. What elements formed the company that was gathered at this feast? They were varied. The sweet and the bitter were mingled. Lazarus was there and Judas! One house may hold very different people. The same Communion Table may draw together characters not only dissimilar but opposed. Lazarus was an object of curiosity and wonder to many (v.⁹). Christ's eye would rest on him with fresh delight.

It is noteworthy that every character in John's Gospel is in place and drawn in consistency with itself. You can recall no word spoken by Lazarus: he is everywhere silent, surrounded by an atmosphere of wonder and reserve. A man, I should say, not wanting in loveableness but in force; a

presence felt in the home, but of less account in the world of action and strife. Martha was, as usual, bustling—'Martha served.' She counted it an honour to serve. It was her nature, her way not of showing her worldliness, but her faith and love. There are many women (let men be thankful) like Martha: they cannot sit still. It is a grand characteristic when linked with a good purpose. Some people like to be waited on and to do nothing. They connect themselves with a cause or a church, but they are not of much help. The world is the better of those who work in it. Be willing not to lead only but to serve. 'All service ranks the same with God.' There is no difficulty in understanding that line of Browning, but only in trying to live it out. Christ's glory too was that of service. 'Even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many.' Martha's type of service was noble. Our households are the better of such energetic and fervent natures. Men and women of this sort may be explosive, and, as Beecher says, carry more steam than they can sometimes manage, but they are visible in the morning and get things done. Martha's failing was that she forgot there were different ways of serving.

3. Mary also was one of the company, but at first seems an intruder. We read in Mark's account—'as He sat at meat there came a woman' (14⁸). This intruder, however, soon became the most prominent member of the company, the observed of all observers, and showed by her original action that she had the best right to be there. What was that ointment of spikenard? It comes from a fragrant plant found in India, and the juice used in preparation of the ointment yields a delicious odour. It was a fine medium for an action as fragrant and fine. Mary too 'served,' but in her own way: she too is in character and acts consistently. She proceeded to anoint the head of the chief guest, as was customary, and could not refrain from wiping the feet at which she had so often sat—'and the house was filled with the odour of the ointment': such is the record of the impression produced on one who was present. What happened? The secret love of this woman's heart was now manifest. Deeds of this sort go beyond themselves, and fill a larger sphere than was first thought of. You may be engaged in a very simple work, but you cannot prevent the influence of your deed widening and spreading. Every one in the

house, in society, in the Church, is diffusing something good or evil. As was said of Professor John Stuart Blackie, you carry your breeze with you. What is the fragrance that should issue from the Communion Table? What influence are we diffusing to-day? 'Behold, how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity! It is like the precious ointment upon the head, that ran down upon the beard, even Aaron's beard, that went down to the skirts of his garments.'

4. And now, like a poison in the atmosphere, starts up the objection of Judas (vv.⁴⁻⁶).

He was far more of an intruder than Mary, and indeed an utter alien. A sacrifice like Mary's is not to be measured by a cold and calculating machine like Judas. Was he a judge of the worth of things? He valued this box of ointment at, say, ten pounds, and his Lord and Master he was willing to part with for a good deal less—thirty pieces of silver! Judas, I admit, was good at calculating, but bad at valuing. To leave Mary's society and stand beside this apostle of economy is to leave summer warmth for freezing cold. Nothing generous can survive in the heart of Judas. Criticism like his is fatal to all nobility. How can a man care for the poor, as he pretended, when he has lost the elementary sense of truth and honour? Care for the poor calls for as much consideration in our day as ever, and for sympathy that requires nobler nurture than that given it by Judas. Let us see to it that our professed reason is always our real reason. Every profession we make, in business, in friendship, in religion, and in going to the Lord's Table, should be a true and honest one. Let us really care for the things we profess to care for. Further, a great deal of our fault-finding, even when honest (like Martha's), is better left unspoken. All should be allowed to do good in their own way. 'Judge not'; 'let a man examine himself.' Women like Mary may sometimes give way to a foolish and extravagant impulse. Some things turn out in experience 'very costly' that were perhaps originally otherwise intended. But on the whole, in a world like ours, Mary's spirit of sacrifice and abandonment is noble and too rare rather than common. Besides, who are we that we should talk of making sacrifices beyond what is called for? 'I do hope,' said James Chalmers, that modern Greatheart, 'we shall for ever wipe the word sacrifice, as concerning what we do, from the missionary speech of

New Guinea.' Is there any sincerity in our glorying in the Cross of Christ, and then narrowly calculating or ignobly restraining every impulse and action it leads us to? There is reason for every so-called sacrifice we make for Christ. 'We love because He first loved.' There was nothing wanting on Christ's part on our behalf. 'I lay down My life for the sheep.' Why should we limit so much our service and sacrifice in return, or look grudgingly and askance at the generosity and devotion of another?

Were the whole realm of nature mine,
That were an offering far too small:
Love so amazing, so Divine,
Demands my soul, my life, my all.

5. This brings us, lastly, to Christ's defence of Mary's anointing.

There are mean and narrow ways of looking at actions, and there are large, generous, and unexpected interpretations, of which every common-looking deed is capable. This was an instance. Christ at once dispersed the cloud raised by Judas. 'The Lord God is a sun and shield.' The Son of Man emphatically was born to be 'an hiding-place from the wind, a covert from the tempest.' Did Mary consciously intend her action as a tribute of affection to Christ and in anticipation of His death? Undoubtedly the Master saw, and read into her action, more than she did. Christ has the true artist's eye that detects new and deeper meanings in what fails to strike or be suggestive to us. A lady objected to Turner that he put things into his pictures, colours and effects, which she could never see in nature! 'No, madam,' replied the great painter, 'but don't you wish you could see them?' Similarly, Christ teaches us to see in our aspirations and attempts more than we were formerly aware of, and He gives us credit for much more than we actually achieve in our blind gropings and half-finished purposes. This is beautiful encouragement for all of us. I believe the best servants of the Lord Jesus think little of what they are able to do. 'My poor bungled work,' said Rabbi Duncan, 'is not well done.' But does Christ take the same view? He is generous in praise as in forgiveness. He gives

liberally without upbraiding. He throws His shield over this woman, and accepts gratefully the offering of love she intended for Him. So with us. Our Lord's recognition goes far beyond our worth. His value-judgments are true and gracious—'*Well done, good and faithful servant!*'

After all, was the woman's deed extravagant? The circumstances were exceptional—'For the poor ye have always with you, but Me ye have not always.' Something lavish even is allowable for the sake of friendship and honour, and when the occasion is more than ordinary. There are times when you are not bound by the limits of common expenditure, when sentiment and the love of the noble and beautiful are better guides than hard and dry necessity.

Give all thou canst; high Heaven rejects the love
Of nicely-calculated less or more.

Such are some of the lessons that gather round this beautiful incident, and that claim attention especially before Communion when we too 'make a supper.' In religion, as in social life, we may carry the habit of reserve and self-repression too far. We must now and then break through ordinary restraints, as this woman broke her alabaster box. Christ delights in genuine manifestations of love from His friends and followers. It was a grateful surprise to Dr. Dale when he returned from Australia and found his congregation had inscribed for him the welcome he had coveted in his absence—'We love you, and we tell you so!'

So Christ values, when we sit at His Table, the expression of our love. He values things that are 'very costly,' not necessarily or at all outward gifts, but repentance, humility, and genuine, devoted love. 'The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit.' Not now or at any time does the Saviour perplex us with many questions, but He makes plain and direct appeal to every one of His followers—'Lovest thou Me?' If we can, like Peter, notwithstanding all the past, give a humble and honest answer, it is enough.

Hark, my soul! it is the Lord;
'Tis thy Saviour, hear His word:
Jesus speaks, and speaks to thee:
'Say, poor sinner, lov'st thou Me?'

Recent Foreign Theology.

Israel in Egypt.¹

PROFESSOR SPIEGELBERG is one of the most active and successful representatives of the new school of Egyptology in Germany. He had the good luck to be at Thebes in 1896, when the Israel stela of Merneptah was unearthed by Flinders Petrie, and he subsequently edited the important inscriptions found that year for publication in Petrie's *Six Temples at Thebes*. The mention of Israel on that stela ('The tribe of Israel is desolated, without fruit of the field'), along with Canaan, Askalon, Gezer, and Palestine (Khor), makes it certain that in Merneptah's days the people dwelt in Syria, and thus necessitates a revision of our ideas on the Sojourn and Exodus. Spiegelberg is by no means a stranger to biblical and Semitic studies, and he has here availed himself of the help of a specialist in them, so that the work may be relied on as abreast of the progress of biblical criticism, as well as of Egyptology.

To the earliest biblical writers, from the ninth century B.C. onwards, the sojourn in Egypt was a fundamental fact in the history of their nation; tradition represented that their great lawgiver was educated as an Egyptian, in spite of the shocks to national pride that this may have occasioned. On the other hand, a late origin of much of the detail in the narrative is betrayed to an Egyptologist at once by the late Egyptian names in the story of Joseph, and is sufficiently patent on other grounds to biblical critics. The account of the Sojourn was at best founded on a vague memory, and it is well known that no direct reference has been found to the Sojourn or the Exodus on the Egyptian monuments; but Spiegelberg looks forward to the discovery of clear evidence in the future. Meanwhile, putting aside detail, he endeavours to fit the most authentic features of the episode into the fabric of Egyptian history. His pamphlet closes with a concise statement of his view, which is eminently worth attention:—

'Amongst the Semitic tribes which settled in Egypt in the seventeenth and sixteenth centuries

B.C., probably in the train of the Hyksos [whose kings themselves bore Semitic names], were the clans which found a welcome in the land of Goshen, a fertile grazing district in the Eastern Delta. In the flourishing days of the Egyptian state, when the eastern boundary was safe, and Syria and Palestine acknowledged the supremacy of Egypt, the tribes in Goshen remained in undisturbed possession of their Egyptian habitation. But under Rameses II. the empire was in a serious situation, and the Egyptian Government began to keep a watch on the foreigners, and oppress them. Eventually, under Merneptah, the son and successor of Rameses II., dangers set in on all sides, bringing the Egyptian empire to the verge of destruction. In the south the Nubian populations revolted: a coalition of Libyans, allied with adventurous hordes of Peoples of the Sea, appeared on the western border of the Delta, and, perhaps at the very same time, a great rebellion broke out in Syria and Palestine. As early as the fourteenth century B.C., in the time of Amenophis IV. (Ekh-naton), the Hebrew tribes, the Khabiri of the Tell-el-Amarna tablets, were a constant source of danger to the vassals of Egypt in Palestine, until Sety I., the father of Ramses II., compelled them to keep the peace; and now they made use of the excellent opportunity to rise against Pharaoh once more, in alliance with other rebellious vassals in Syria. These Hebrew tribes, afterwards conquered by Merneptah, included the tribe of Israel, which possibly was in touch with the Goshen tribes still remaining in the Delta. In any case, whether the last conjecture be right or wrong, the tribes in Goshen, embittered by oppression, availed themselves of the distressed condition of Egypt to demand leave to depart in freedom. Merneptah was compelled to grant it, in view of the perils which beset him on every side, as well as for other political reasons. The Goshen tribes, however, returned back to the land from which they had sprung, and took part in the battles which eventually (about 1100 B.C.) freed Syria and Palestine from the Egyptian supremacy.'

The argument on which this conclusion is founded is not very closely reasoned, and indeed it does not claim to give the only possible solution of the problem. But both the argument and the

¹ *Der Aufenthalt Israels in Aegypten im Lichte der aegyptischen monumente.* Von Wilhelm Spiegelberg, a. o. Professor an der Universität Strassburg. Strassburg: Schlesier u. Schweikhardt, 1904.

conclusion are illuminating and suggestive, and, so far probably as the author intends, convincing. The recognition of tribes who sojourned in Egypt, represented by Jacob, as separate from the (larger) Israel which remained in Palestine, is due to Maspero, but Spiegelberg is, I believe, the first to show how well the new evidence can be made to fit the date in the reign of Merneptah to which tradition and historical criticism has long tended to assign the Exodus.

Spiegelberg has brought together many scattered scraps of evidence from the Egyptological side which bear upon his subject. The illustrations, twelve in number, are well chosen; it might perhaps have been noted that the age of the 'stone chambers' discovered at Pithom require investigation. No doubt such buildings existed in the reign of Rameses II., but those in the photograph appear to have been in use nearly a thousand years later (see Petrie's *Tanis*, part i., for a note of some objects found thrown out of them by the excavators); also the ploughing scene on p. 36, attributed to the seventeenth century B.C., *i.e.* the period of the Hyksos, cannot be more than twenty years older than the scene of brickmaking on p. 37, which is correctly dated in the fifteenth century B.C. The former is from the tomb of Pahud al El Kab, and it has been observed that the supposed Semites figured in the tomb are fat old men with practically bald but unshaven heads, to whom are assigned the lighter and often superior tasks in the fields—guiding the plough while younger men drag it, and cutting up the fish when netted by the younger men. None the less they may be old Semite slaves. The overlooking of these points is easily explained, and they do not really affect Spiegelberg's arguments. The pamphlet should be read by all who are interested in the history of Israel.

F. LL. GRIFFITH.

The Sources of the Clementines.¹

PFARRER WAITZ contributes to the *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur* an elaborate treatise, containing the results of his critical investigations into the difficult

problem of the sources of *The pseudo-Clementine Homilies and Recognitions*. Meyboom's recent monograph on this subject is said to furnish convincing proof that the condition of real progress in the scientific appreciation of these writings is critical study of their sources after the manner of Hilgenfeld.

Waitz begins by calling attention to the difference of opinion amongst scholars in regard to the *Grundschrift* of the Clementines. His conclusion is that *The Epistle of Clement to James* did not originally belong either to the *Homilies* or to the *Recognitions*, but to an earlier writing nearly related to them, and forming their common basis. Langen's view that the so-called *Epitome* contains the earliest document is refuted at length. The question of the priority of the *Homilies* (Baur, Schwegler, etc.) or of the *Recognitions* (Hilgenfeld, Ritschl, etc.) is next discussed.

The two writings are compared in detail, with the result that neither can be called primary in the absolute sense of the word. Both are traced to a common source. The *Grundschrift* is then reconstructed, and patristic testimony in favour of its existence is adduced. Its contents reveal no ecclesiastical (hierarchical) tendency, such as Langen finds in the *Epitome*, and no dogmatic (Jewish-Christian) tendency, such as Baur finds in the *Homilies*; its purpose is practical—the instruction and edifying of catechumens. Its date cannot be earlier, and is probably later than the second half of the second century.

In the second and principal part of his work Waitz inquires into the sources of the Clementines, *i.e.* of the *Grundschrift*. *The Epistle of Peter to James*, with the *διαμαρτυρία*, is said to furnish the most important clue. It points to a source in which Waitz recognizes the *Κηρύγματα Πέτρου*. A second source is a document to which he gives the title *Πράξεις Πέτρου*, after the analogy of other apocryphal Acts. These are the main sources of the pseudo-Clementine writings, but it is probable that use was also made of the *Dialogue between Clement and Appion* on heathen mythology, and of a writing by Bardesanes *περὶ εἰσαγωγῆς*.

Part iii. contains an exhaustive examination of the quotations from the O.T. and from the N.T. in the various Clementine writings. Differences in method are carefully noted in the documents, as Waitz reconstructs them. He agrees with Uhl-

¹ *Die pseudoklementinen Homilien und Rekognitionen. Eine quellenkritische Untersuchung von Lic. Hans Waitz, Pfarrer in Darmstadt. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1904. Price M. 13.*

mann and Lehmann that the redactor of the *Recognitions* kept closely to the canonical writings, and made use of Mt, Lk, and Jn, as well as of Pauline and Catholic Epistles.

Within the limits implied in the title of his scholarly work, Pfarrer Waitz has made an exceedingly valuable contribution to the history of early Christian literature. Only specialists are competent to pronounce judgment upon some of his theories; all will admire the thoroughness of his researches, and profit by his accumulation of evidence. He is, doubtless, right in saying that these writings have been either over-rated or under-estimated by the majority of critics. 'As early Christian apologies against heathenism and against heresy, they have not yet been sufficiently valued. They are, however, of the greatest importance for the history and criticism of the biblical text and canon, on account of their numerous and generally unique biblical, especially N.T., quotations.'

J. G. TASKER.

Handsworth College.

Among the Periodicals.

The Babel-Bibel Controversy.

IN Lic. P. Volz's article, 'Was wir von den babylonischen Ausgrabungen lernen' (*Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, 1903, pp. 193-233), a very earnest endeavour is made to grapple with the real questions that are raised by the *Babel-Bibel* controversy. A summary is given of all that we learn from the cuneiform inscriptions regarding the very advanced culture that existed in Babylonia three or four millenniums before the Christian era, as well as regarding the religious conceptions and feelings that find expression alike in the cosmogonic legends and in such remarkable literary products as the Babylonian 'Penitential Psalms.' After dealing with Babylonian culture *per se*, our author goes on to show the relation of this to the culture and civilization of the world in general, and then passes to what will be felt by many to be the most valuable part of the article, that dealing with the significance of Babylon for what we find in Israel. Lic. Volz, while admitting the obligations of the latter to the former in the sphere both of culture and religion, argues strongly that the prophetic religion of Israel is a thing *sui generis*,

and as little to be explained from Babylonian notions as the form which the Faust legend assumed in the hands of Goethe can be explained by crude, early legends, or the magnificent products of Greek art can be explained from rude antique models. It is not the creating of its materials, but the manner of treating them, that constitutes for Lic. Volz the originality and the uniqueness of the religion of Israel. Many who have had the same feeling will be glad to note his declaration that even if the *name* Jahweh should be proved to occur outside Israel (as Professor Hommel and others claim that it does), this circumstance would be of very little significance as far as concerns the origin and development of the *idea* of Jahweh in Israel. Upon the whole, Lic. Volz finds that the monuments have only an indirect bearing upon Scripture, touching the periphery merely, and not the centre; by far the most important information derived from them concerns the domain of profane history and civilization. Here, indeed, their importance can scarcely be exaggerated. They have brought to our knowledge a history, whose records had long slumbered in the dust. The ancient world, which has thus risen from the dead, has an interest of its own quite apart from the Bible, or any relation to Israel; and it will be one beneficial result of the *Babel-Bibel* controversy if a deeper and more general interest is awakened in the records of great empires which have long since passed away, but whose influence still makes itself felt at many points.

The 'Note-Line' in Hebrew.

The theory of the meaning of the sign *pāsēk*, recently propounded by Dr. J. Kennedy in *The Note-line in the Hebrew Scriptures* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark) has attracted a considerable amount of attention from Hebrew scholars both at home and abroad. Even in quarters where the theory has been wholly or partially rejected, the ability and diligence of the author have met with the fullest recognition. This remark applies in particular to two valuable reviews which the book has received from two such experts as Professor A. Klostermann of Kiel and Professor Ed. König of Bonn.

Professor Klostermann, writing in the *Theol. Literaturblatt* of 25th March last, devotes no less than 8½ columns to a notice of Dr. Kennedy's

book, which he declares he has studied with the greatest care, and from which he testifies to have received stimulus in many ways. At the same time he protests against Dr. Kennedy's attempt to fit his theory of *pāsēk* to all the cases where the sign occurs. The old explanation of the sign as a 'separator' or 'divider,' appears to Professor Klostermann to cover the facts much better than Dr. Kennedy's suggestion that it serves much the same purpose as our *N.B.* At the same time he feels that the very one-sidedness of the theory propounded by the Edinburgh scholar will promote investigation, while the complete list given of all *pāsēk* passages in the O.T. is pronounced specially valuable.

Professor König's critique appears in the *Studien und Kritiken* of last April, p. 448 ff. This well-known Hebrew scholar, who in his *Lehrge-*

bäude (i. 122 f.) translates the section of the *Dikdūkê ha-tēāmim* dealing with *pāsēk*, is of opinion that Dr. Kennedy is upon the right lines in contending that the sign has in many cases the intention of calling attention to the Hebrew text, whether as questioning its present form [being thus = our ?] or as emphasizing that form [= our sic!]. At the same time Professor König can see nothing in Dr. Kennedy's contentions that might not quite well be included in the traditional explanation of *pāsēk*. Instead of the term 'Note-line' adopted by Dr. Kennedy, he suggests that 'Critical line' (*Kritikstrich*) might be a more suitable designation. Like Professor Klostermann, he praises the diligence of Dr. Kennedy in compiling the useful list of *pāsēk* passages.

J. A. SELBIE.

Maryculter, Aberdeen.

The Theology of St. John.

BY PROFESSOR THE REV. GEORGE G. FINDLAY, D.D., HEADINGLEY COLLEGE, LEEDS.

I. The Knowledge of God.

OUR prolegomena must be brief. On two points some preliminary observations are necessary.

(1) We take the Gospel, the Epistles, and the Revelation ascribed to St. John to be all of them the true work of this apostle, though some of us, probably, hesitate about the last of the three. The Johannine authorship of the Fourth Gospel surely guarantees its historicity. The recent verdict of a very keen and learned critic, which makes this writing to be genuine but not authentic, pronouncing it in its most wonderful parts a theological romance composed by the beloved disciple to the glory of his Master, is not a judgment that can reasonably stand. The Book of the Revelation is isolated by its nature; and the close resemblance, amounting to continuity, between the Gospel and First Epistle throws into stronger relief its peculiarities. Wide, however, as the chasm is between Gospel and Apocalypse, there are numerous threads of connexion across it; the distance is not wider than that which in other instances separates the productions of an original and comprehensive genius composed in different moods and in different forms of literature. Beside the

detailed correspondences of language and idea, the two works severally exhibit, in their contrasted modes, a dramatic grasp and conception of the subject, an artistic unity realized in a manner altogether naïve and untechnical, a love of symmetry and balance in the development of narrative or vision, which go to vindicate them for the offspring of the same unique and powerful mind.

The Gospel is a historical, the Revelation a prophetic drama, with the same Divine personage dominating both. The former might be entitled, *The Coming of the Incarnate Word*; the latter, *The Victory of the Slain Lamb*. The Gospel rehearses the conflict between the historical Christ and the evil world of Judaism; the Apocalypse reflects the conflict between the glorified Christ and the evil world of the Roman Empire. This latter struggle, whose tragic beginnings St. John witnessed, he projects in vast proportions against the storm-clouds veiling his horizon, which he sees charged with mysterious issues of glory and of judgment.

The Book of Revelation must be put, however, for our purpose upon one side. The material for

the construction of the apostle's doctrine is drawn from his positive and matter-of-fact writings; the speculative Apocalypse (in any case proceeding from the Johannine school) comes in to illustrate the teaching of Gospel and Epistles; doubts respecting its authorship would leave our findings substantially unaffected.

(2) The personality of the author is singularly elusive; when we try to seize it at any point in the narrative, we are reminded of what is said on one occasion about Jesus: 'He conveyed himself away, a multitude being in the place.' St. John's was a retired, secretive nature,—a mind pondering, contemplative, slow to reach its full stature. One of the first two of our Lord's disciples, he came last to his rights in the New Testament. His experience embraced the alpha and omega of the apostolic age. Writing his Gospel, John loses himself in his subject, to find himself there constantly. St. John renders the thoughts of Jesus in a manner so much his own, that the reader will sometimes doubt whether the words he is following are those of Master or disciple. But if Jesus speaks like John, was it not because John had learnt to think and speak like Jesus? Love absorbed him in his Lord. During a long life abiding in Christ, and Christ's words abiding in him through an unbroken recollection and by communion with His Spirit, he became one with Christ as a branch with its vine. The Synoptic records, having the Petrine tradition for their nucleus, convey a different impression of the method and topics of our Lord's ministry; but the difference is no contradiction: the two representations are complementary, as the temperament of the two apostles from whom they principally proceed. We may take it, too, that the Fourth Evangelist aimed at supplying what others had left for him to add. Certain strains of our Lord's doctrine of inestimable value, and scenes in His work of decisive importance, *found* John as they did not find the other reporters; and he echoes faithfully the tone and accent of Jesus in those parts of His ministry which it fell within his plan to relate. His close acquaintance with Jesus, and the sense of continued possession by His Spirit characteristic of St. John, justified the freedom with which he appears to have summarized in some cases and paraphrased, or even enlarged upon, the original sayings, sure of conveying the drift and spirit of what was uttered on the given occasion. The striking reproduction in the First

Epistle of the salient ideas of the Gospel is to be explained by the deep communion of Master and disciple, and not by any supposed adaptation of the teachings of Jesus on St. John's part to his subjective conceptions. He is conscious only of being a mirror of the glory he beheld in the Only-begotten Son of God, a witness to Him who was 'the faithful and true Witness' of God; and he is a writer whom we may safely take at his own estimate.

For the sake of formal exactness, it would be necessary to analyse separately, in the first instance, the doctrine of the Epistles, along with the Prologue of the Gospel and such other passages of it as contain the Evangelist's comments. In this rapid survey the distinction must be dispensed with, and when made it does not amount to very much. The differences in form of expression and mental atmosphere involved in the fact that St. John writes more than half a century after the death of Jesus, and amidst Churches gathered from the Gentiles, explains such matters as the Logos-phraseology and the distant manner of reference to the Jews, but does not affect the substance of the thought conveyed.

St. John has a firm grasp of the actual, notwithstanding his mysticism; outward things are all symbolic to him, and therefore the more exactly noted; to no writer is truth of fact more sacred. The realities of sense he sees clearly and sharply, but he sees through them, and 'feels through all this earthly dress bright shoots of everlastingness.' His narrative moves with a large and free step, not lingering in detail, but fastening on the significant points of the history, that reveal to him its inner connexion and hidden springs.

St. John's teaching is difficult to methodize, and is apt to suffer in the process. His mode of thinking is intuitive rather than logical; his style aphoristic and axiomatic, not dialectical. His ideas have crystallized into sentences that are the fruit of long meditation, and probably of frequent repetition, which must be turned to the light this way and that before they yield their meaning. The connexion of thought with thought is discovered in the intrinsic relation of the successive conceptions presented and in the grouping and shaping of the whole matter, and is but slightly indicated in the texture of the writing. This is due partly to the Hebraistic limitations of St. John's training, but still more to the cast of his

mind, which makes little demand on the resources of Greek periodic structure. Beneath his simple vocabulary there is a most subtle under-play of idea; and his calmness hides a fire of passion too intense for vehemence. His argument in the Epistle moves like a deep stream confined within winding banks, which sways into eddies now on this side and now on that side of its course, as in its flow it circles for awhile round some centre of reflexion, and in the next paragraph is found absorbed in quite another focus; but all these motions contribute to the onward sweep of the tide, and carry us to the predestined goal.

We will attempt to review St. John's teaching under the three following topics: (1) GOD, or *the knowledge of the Father*; (2) THE SON OF GOD, or *the mission and nature of Jesus*; (3) THE WORLD,—*salvation and judgment, life and death*, as these result from the knowledge of God brought to mankind in the coming of Christ. *Light, Love, Life* may serve as mottos for our three divisions. The Gospel, Apocalypse, and Epistles—with some straining of the idea in the second case—may be severally associated with the three subjects in chief. In the Gospel, Jesus makes Himself an instrument to the revelation of the Father and 'seeks His glory that sent him,' saying of the Spirit who follows, 'He shall glorify me'; in the Revelation His majesty shines forth in unveiled splendour, and the Lamb shares the throne of God. In the Epistles we find the Church, under the anointing of the Holy Spirit, living out its Master's life amidst an evil and decaying world, and unfolding the seed of God planted in the world by His hand.

We should not be true to our Lord's aim as it is manifest in the Fourth Gospel, if we did not posit the foundation of Christian thought in *the apprehension of God*. We think of Christ as 'Son of God' under the preconception of the Godhead that He gives. 'Righteous Father,—and the world knew thee not; but I have known thee, and these have known that *thou* didst send me. And I have made known to them thy name, and will make it known.' So Jesus in departing summed up His work, past and to come. It is needless to multiply quotations to this effect: the thought is pervasive and fundamental to the Gospel. With Jesus was lodged the perfect and saving knowledge of God,—a knowledge superhuman in its origin and range and utterly transcending all historical antecedents, that filled His

consciousness, that flowed into His soul by a constant and unchecked communion, and that carried with it a complete unity of will and action between Himself and God the Father. This knowledge of the character and purposes of God, possessed by Jesus alone, supplies the centre and spring of life, the secret of the universe for mankind.

In the controversies of Jesus with the Jewish authorities, we find Him in each debate leading up to or falling back upon the authority of God that He felt within Him, and the character of God as He knew Him—the God whom the Jews claimed for their own, and of whom they should have known enough to recognize His Son, but whom they could only know adequately and to their salvation through His witness. Behind His conflict with the world, and His communion with the disciples, there lay a sense of intimacy with the unseen God that is unique in human consciousness, and lies in a plane above that of the holiest of religious men. It was the attraction of God, as Jesus once said, that drew men to Him—'Every one that hath heard and learned of the Father, cometh unto me,'—the craving to know God in truth, the sense of the power of God in and about Jesus, the fact that, like no other prophet or teacher, He 'spoke the words of God,' the things that He had 'heard with the Father,' and that God was 'dwelling in Him' and 'doing His works' in the deeds of His Son. Seeing Him, He said to the disciples, was in fact one thing with 'seeing the Father.' For the apostle, the sum of Christianity is contained in the last sentences of his Epistle and his Prologue: 'This is the true (the veritable) God and eternal life'; 'God no one hath seen at any time; the only-begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father,—He hath declared Him.' This manifestation and expounding of God formed, above all else, 'the testimony of Jesus,' which the martyr Church held fast in face of Judaism, Paganism, and Gnosticism, which it sealed with its blood, as Christ had sealed it with His own. 'This is eternal life,' the Lord said to the Father, 'to know thee'!

I. GOD IS KNOWABLE.

It is worth while saying, then, before we go further, that, according to St. John's doctrine, *God is knowable in His true being*. The Gnostics (who were Agnostics too) said, 'In the beginning was

God and silence'; but here, 'In the beginning was *the Word*'—a title of Jesus which owes more to the Old Testament than to Hellenism. The true God is One who speaks, who has had His Word by Him from eternity and lives in converse with His creatures. His Word is one with Him; it utters His very self. God is essentially self-imparting. Creation is revelation; for the Word was its agent. Creature-life is the expression of God, since it sprang from the Word and flashed into light in the intelligence of man. Those first verses of the Prologue are not a rationale of the finite universe, nor are they so much a definition of the place of Christ in relation to God and the world; they set forth the attitude and movement toward the world of God Himself; they trace to the fountain of the Deity, through the previous stages of existence, the manifestation of God beheld in Jesus. The glory visible in the Only-begotten was the breaking forth of a light which, veiled in lower forms of life and obscured by the conflict with sin in humanity, and in the Jewish race on whom it shone with favour, was always 'in the world,' and yet was always 'coming into the world' and progressing towards its desired and consummate advent. God by His Word, who stands incarnate in Jesus, was from the beginning a revealing God.

2. GOD IS SPIRIT.

Amongst the axioms concerning God of the Johannine writings, the saying of Jesus to the Samaritan woman, *God is spirit*, claims prior attention. 'There cometh an hour,' He said, 'when neither in this mountain nor in Jerusalem shall men worship the Father, . . . when the true worshippers will worship the Father in spirit and truth; for indeed the Father is seeking such for His worshippers. God is a spirit; and those who worship Him must worship in spirit and in truth.' God is known as spirit—pure personal being—through the spirit of man meeting Him in true worship. These epoch-making words involved, strictly speaking, no new doctrine; but only the principle of the monotheistic creed common to Jew and Samaritan, as this was implied, for instance, in the Second Commandment of the Decalogue—a principle powerfully enforced by later Israelite prophets. But Jesus penetrates to the heart of that creed, and draws its consequences as no one had done before Him; He asserts them with a

lawgiver's authority. The pure spirituality of God makes all national prerogatives and local distinctions in regard to His presence illusory. Henceforth He shall be known as the Father of spirits, everywhere inviting and everywhere accessible to the sincere approach of the human spirit. The few recorded occasions of the intercourse of Jesus with souls outside the pale of Judaism are all of them memorable: they moved His heart in a peculiar way, and elicited the latent universalism of His gospel. His meeting with the outcast woman at the well of Sychar drew from Him the prophecy of the worship wide as the race, pure as the cleansed spirit of man, and meeting the desires of God, which He knew Himself destined to establish.

At the same time, these words appear to reflect the thoughts of Jesus during His recent sojourn in Jerusalem, when He scourged the traffickers from His Father's house, and found Zion in effect no more sacred than Gerizim. They reflect His observation of the false worshippers thronging the Temple, and His presentiment of its overthrow. He foresaw at this early date the inevitable breach with Judaism. The system of local sanctuaries—with their ceremonial cults and privileged orders and carnal ordinances—was radically defective: it was inconsistent with the nature of God; it was producing now more false worshippers than true. Another temple, 'made without hands' and open to God's faithful children in every land, will take the place of the Jewish shrine, soon to be destroyed by its own unfaithful ministers.

With the maxim 'God is Spirit' one connects the sayings that identify God with *life*. When Jesus declares, 'The living Father sent me, and I live because of the Father,' He asserts for Himself a life resting upon His spiritual oneness with God and His unbroken filial communion with God, while it is presented and conveyed to men through His visible humanity in the form of 'flesh' and 'blood.' Out of this store He can feed the whole world, since His being is drawn from the eternal vitality of God. Thus Jesus supplies in His person 'the true bread of God'; in contrast with the manna dispensed by Moses, which was perishing though miraculous, as it was of earthly origin and fed but the mortal body; whereas 'the words that I have spoken to you,' He adds, 'they are spirit and they *are* life.' For His words breathe into the souls of men the inmost mind

and will, the very life of God; 'it is the Spirit that giveth life.'

3. GOD IS LIGHT.

If the term spirit describes the nature of the true God, the most comprehensive view of the Divine character is given in St. John's saying that *God is light*. His Epistle begins: 'This is the message which we have heard from Him (from the Word of Life) and report to you,—that God is light, and in Him is no darkness at all.' That sentence reflects the first impression of Christ's revelation on contemporary minds. God was breaking on the world in radiant, wondrous, unsullied light. St. Paul describes his experience in similar language: 'God, who said Light shall shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of His glory in the face of Jesus Christ.'

This implies *knowledge*, to be sure—an intellectual apprehension of the Divine; light is truth, in its splendour and clearness. The relations of the Christian to God are expressed by St. John in terms of knowledge almost as freely as in terms of faith. But knowledge with St. John is a pregnant term; it goes far beyond the bare notional. *Persons* are not known by mere intellect. The affections and will participate in every acquaintanceship, most of all in this. The light of God in Christ pours forth from His whole nature, and acts upon the whole nature of man.

The character of God, disclosed in Christ, is the substance of the new light dawning on mankind. The apostle brings out its moral quality when he adds, 'and in Him is no darkness at all.' Paganism, with its many gods of motley hue, good and evil, pure and wanton, kind and cruel, presented a notion of the Divine wholly shifting and uncertain, and that afforded no ground for reverence or trust. Light means purity, truth, goodness; while darkness means foulness, falsehood, malice, sin. There was plenty of these latter qualities in the heathen gods; there is nothing of them in the God and Father of Christ. Idolatry lays the most horrible incubus upon mankind, in the fact that it instils vile notions about God, notions by which wrong is imbedded in the Divine nature and the very fount of being is contaminated. To exchange the many gods and lords of Paganism for the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, to see the sky washed clean of

those foul shapes, to have the haunting idols with their weird and shameful spells, those veritable demons, banished from the imagination and replaced by the pure image of the God incarnated in Christ, and to know that the Lord of all the worlds is the Father of men and is absolute rectitude, wisdom, and love, this was indeed to pass out of darkness into marvellous light.

The apostle's conception in the Epistle of God as pure 'light' includes the qualities specifically ascribed to Him in the language of Jesus, after the devout style of the Old Testament. God is the '*righteous* Father' whom 'the world hath not known,' since His dealings with mankind, well known to Jesus, have been marked by a perfect rectitude, being consistent with His declared will and law, and with His fatherly relationship to men. He is the '*holy* Father,' in that intrinsic worth of being by which He stands utterly remote from the sinfulness of men. In virtue of this character, by the power and in the shelter of His own 'name,' the Father is besought to 'keep from the evil' of the world those who belong to Jesus and to Him. He is asked, being the 'holy Father,' to 'sanctify them in the truth'—in that knowledge of Himself, that responsive apprehension of His name and word, which links the soul to the realities of being.

In line with these designations is the epithet 'true,' when employed of God in its ethical signification. Our ambiguous 'true' represents the *ἀληθινός* (*verus*) of St. John's Greek in Gospel and Epistle, under which he writes of 'the true God' (as of 'the true light,' 'the true worshippers') by contrast with false idols; for God is the great Reality, in whom name and being absolutely match. But the term *ἀληθής* (*verax*) of the Gospels, to which *ἀληθινός* corresponds in the Apocalypse (for it seems that there St. John wrote with less knowledge of Greek, or less literary help, than in his other works), has another meaning. Jesus is reported saying, 'He that sent me is *true*,' where He declares that His message comes from God who cannot err or lie, who abides by every word He has said through His Messenger. Behind the words of Jesus lies the veracity of God. Accordingly the man 'who receives' Christ's 'witness, has set to his seal that God is true'; he has put his affidavit to the affirmations of God Himself. On the contrary, to contradict that witness is to commit the blasphemy of 'making

God a liar'; it is to give the lie to the Author and Fountain of truth.

The above three adjectives, it is to be observed, are those which the writer of the Apocalypse applies by predilection to the character, the 'ways' and 'judgments' of God. In the revelations of His holiness, righteousness, truth, the glorious light of God had long been coming to its own in Israel: these elements furnish a chief and fundamental part, but not the whole, of the knowledge of God the Father conveyed through Jesus Christ; they are subsumed in His teaching.

4. GOD IS LOVE.

God is righteous; God is holy, and true: this the Old Testament had said. The words *God is love* it remained for St. John to utter, in gathering to a point the doctrine of Christ and the New Testament. Light, to be sure, includes more than love, as darkness and sin include more than hate. God is love; but love is not everything in God. To say that this is so, to reduce righteousness and truth and holiness to mere phases of love, would be to stultify the attribute that one seeks to exalt. Love has a value proportioned to the integrity of the lover's character. His moral grandeur gives to the love of Jesus overwhelming power; it is the Holy One of God who 'loved me and gave himself up for me.' The love of a God nothing but love, would be an affection without substance and without aim, an amorphous sentiment,—a sheer non-sense. God was seen already in the light of His righteousness and truth, when Jesus came with the message of His grace; His love is the love of the All-holy, All-wise, Almighty God.

This was, however, the new and astonishing part of Christ's doctrine about God—that He 'so loved the world.' In the mingled colours that make up the white awful light of the Divine character, as it is finally disclosed by Christ, love supplies the conspicuous hue. Love was the motive of salvation, the impulse which prompted the sending of the Son of God; it is the attribute that, above others, marks God as *Father* of Christ and of man. Love is not the exclusive, but it is the dominant note in the whole strain of the New Testament; and in St. John's pages it swells to its fullest compass and loftiest utterance. St. Paul's favourite expression, 'the grace of God,' is not used by St. John, who goes back from the stream to the fountain, and finds the spring of all grace

in God's essential love. *Χάρις* takes the place of *ἀγάπη* with him only in the saying, 'Grace and truth came through Jesus Christ,' where 'grace' signifies God's loving favour and forgivingness to the unworthy in contrast to the unsparing régime of the Mosaic law.

Jesus Christ presented Himself as the embodiment, still more than the witness, of God's love to mankind. 'God gave His Son, the Only-begotten, that every one who believes in Him should have eternal life [the Evangelist's words, rather than those of Jesus: in Jn 3¹⁶]. For God did not send the Son into the world that He might judge the world, but that the world through Him might be saved.' This is love shown not in word, but in deed and gift; and not in the gift of something created and external to the Godhead,—it was the gift of the Only-begotten, beside whom God had no other, who was the object of His love in the beginning before the world was, who was '*the Son*' to '*the Father*.'

Jesus dwelt in His teaching, as we know from the Synoptists, on the natural proofs of God's bounty, in rain and sunshine, and the like. Both there and with St. John the gift of the Spirit is held out as the chief of the 'good things' proceeding from God's fatherly interest in men. But St. John's mind was fastened upon this one bestowment, as though there were no other,—a gift immense in itself and coming from 'the bosom of the Father,' a gift imparted without reserve and identified with man, with his earthly existence and with the need created by his sin; for 'the Word became flesh and tabernacled amongst us': He '*gave His Son*: to be a propitiation for our sins.' No familiarity lessens the wonder of this gift; no other event in history, no possession that mankind may acquire, can eclipse in any wise the glory of the manifestation made in it of God's goodwill and His resolution to save the world. Love is all our wealth; and 'herein know we love. 'Herein is love: not that we loved God'—His love went out to a race unworthy and cold toward the Infinite Goodness—'but that He loved us, and sent His Son to be the propitiation for our sins,'—'sent His only-begotten Son into the world, that we might live through Him,' 'sent the Son as Saviour of the world.' Thus the apostle interprets his saying, that 'God is love.' Before the Son of God came and offered His sacrifice for sin, who would have thought of describing the Godhead by this one

predicate? Now God's love flames out with such burning glory, and appeals to the world with such speaking evidence, that all other attributes of the Divine seem to be lost in this.

But the Father's love to the world in Christ is no blind passion; it is a moral affection, that has respect to the character of God and the conscience of its objects. It taxes itself, therefore, to find *propitiation* for its sinful beneficiaries; it requires trust and submission on their part. The love of God operates under ethical conditions; it founds its remedial agencies upon a basis of righteousness and truth; and thus restores the bonds of a holy fellowship between God and the world He saves from perishing.

The Divine love, therefore, is *selective*. While God loved the world—not Israel alone—and has sent His Son for its Saviour, His regard finds its abiding objects in 'so many as receive' the Son, in those who come to 'know the love that God hath toward us,' and meet it with a welcome. 'The Father Himself loveth you,' said Jesus to His chosen, 'because you have loved me, and believed that I came out from God'; again, 'If a man love me, my Father will love him, and we will come to him and make our abode with him.' The Father's Messenger could not manifest Himself to the world, while it rejected the Father's word in Him and met His overtures with an obstinate repulse. 'They have both seen and hated both me and my Father,' said Jesus, summing up His sad experience of the Jewish people. God does not meet hate with hate. But His love toward such a world is mixed with anger; and the very chapter of John's Gospel which declares that 'God so loved the world that He gave His only-begotten Son,' ends with the terrible words: 'He that obeyeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abides on him.' How fearfully that wrath of Almighty God thunders and flames in the Apocalypse, against the haters of His Son and the murderers of His people, there is no need to recall.

But behind all the love of God to men, an earlier Divine love is revealed in the words of Jesus to the Father: 'Thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world.' What a door this saying opens into heaven! It will not do to explain this as a love of contemplation, embracing its object before its birth; for in the same connexion Jesus speaks of 'the glory which I *had with thee* before the world was.' Such sayings as these—which are

surely beyond the reach of imagination or invention, on any author's part—speak for a consciousness of the Divine affection enjoyed by Jesus Christ which lay at the back of creation; they reveal God as being love eternally, and possessing an object for His love in the Word that 'was with' Him 'in the beginning.' On this love of God to Christ, which antedates creation, He appears to ground in His high-priestly prayer the love that God bears to His disciples; for He asks 'that the love wherewith thou hast loved me, may be in them.' As Jesus drew life for us from the absolute life that belonged to Him in God, He finds love for us in the eternal love with which God looked on Him.

5. THE FATHER.

All the disclosures of God and views of the Divine character and action that we gain from the teachings of Master and disciple, in Gospel and Epistle, are gathered up in the word *Father*, the *Father*, in the use of which the Apostle John reproduces the very style of Jesus. St. John quotes this name not only much more frequently than the other Evangelists—as often, indeed, as all of them together—but also more exclusively in reference to the relationship of Christ to God. Only in the message sent at His resurrection does Jesus speak of God to His disciples as '*your Father*,' when He says, 'I ascend to my Father and your Father, to my God and your God,' throwing by that repeated 'and' a bridge over a chasm unsounded and hitherto impassable. He associates Himself with His followers in filial relationship to God, yet with a solemn distinction and reserve. Never in any of the Gospels is Jesus recorded saying of God 'our Father' with inclusion of Himself.

Those cherished sayings of the Synoptic history are wanting here, in which our Lord pointed His disciples to the care and watchful guardianship of 'your heavenly Father,' and taught them to pray to 'our Father which art in heaven.' St. John is absorbed in the thought of Christ's Sonship as the ground of all childlike relations on man's part to God, and all fatherly approaches of God to man. In His prophecy addressed to the woman of Samaria, 'the Father' who seeks His 'true worshippers' everywhere, is revealed as the Father of all men of the Spirit, from the hour of Christ's coming; when the Jews, on the other hand, claimed in antagonism to Jesus to have 'one Father, even God,' He sternly denied the sonship

and fathers them upon 'the Devil,' since they 'do his lusts,' and their falsehood and the murder they were designing spring from Satan. To His disciples He says, 'None cometh to the Father but through me'; 'I am the door,' 'I am the way.' God is intimately near in His paternal love to men and graciously accessible—the way is plain, the door is open; but access is through the offices of Christ; other ways are barred. So it stands in the First Epistle: 'Whosoever denieth the Son, hath not the Father either; he that confesseth the Son, hath the Father also.' This dependence on Jesus Christ for filial standing before God, as well as for true knowledge of God, is intimated in the later words of the Epistle: 'He that hath the Son of God, hath life; he that hath not the Son of God, hath not life.' 'The antichrist,' therefore, is an antitheist too; 'he denies the Father and the Son,' in one breath contradicting the filial Deity of Christ and the eternal Fatherhood of God.

In writing his Gospel, St. John seems to be jealous of any expression that might appear to trench upon the sole Sonship of Jesus Christ; the title 'Son of God' is His unshared designation, and 'the Father' signifies, almost invariably, *His* Father. This mode of speech, presumably, reflects the prevailing attitude of Jesus to 'the Father': 'the Father and the Son,'—these are the two actors that fill the scene. 'The world' of men is the sphere into which 'the Father sends the Son.' The disciples are those whom 'the Father gives' to the Son; they are exchanged or shared between the Two as 'thine and mine'; they are 'branches' in the vine of which the Son is the vine-stock and the 'Father the vine-dresser'; 'sheep' for the Father's flock, of which the Son is the faithful shepherd. Amongst the heathen also, outside of

'this (Israelite) fold,' there are 'scattered abroad, children of God,' for whose sake He permits His Son to die. All His earthly children the Father regards with an infinite love, making the Son the channel of His love to all alike. Gathered around Him and ranged under His leadership, 'bought for God,' as the Apocalypse describes it, in His blood, 'out of every nation and tongue,' they people the heavenly city and fill the Father's house of many dwellings. Then 'the tabernacle of God shall be with men; and God Himself shall be with them as their God, and shall wipe away every tear from their eyes.' 'The Lord God the Almighty is the temple' of the city, and His glory is all its light; 'the Lamb is *the lamp* thereof.' So the eternal blessedness of the saints is the eternal impartation of God Himself to them in Christ.

From the concentration of the light of Divine knowledge in Jesus Christ—the idea in which the Johannine theology is rooted—it ensues that God is viewed and thought of through His character. He is what Jesus Christ exhibits, in word, deed, and disposition,—that and no other. 'We beheld his glory,' writes John in the Prologue, 'glory as of an Only-begotten from a Father, full of grace and truth,'—the one person in whom God is exactly and adequately mirrored. The Unseen is seen! God, who is Spirit, is manifest, and palpable, in the flesh. The Word of the Eternal, which spoke in the forms of nature and through the course of history in broken and contradicted utterance, now voices itself through human lips in clear tones of grace and truth to the universal heart. We know through His image in His Son what the Most High is really like, and what are His thoughts and purpose for our race.

Literary Illustrations of the Sermon on the Mount.

BY THE REV. JAMES MOFFATT, D.D., DUNDONALD.

THE BEATITUDES:

'No list of circumstances will ever make a paradise.'—GEORGE ELIOT.

'There are no real pleasures without real needs.'—VOLTAIRE.

Mt 5³ 'The spirit is the seat of this poverty,

just as the heart is of this purity' of the Gospel.—LOISY.

Mt 5⁵. See Fiske's *Man's Destiny*, chap. xv.

Mt 5⁸ "Hold off from sensuality," says Cicero, "for if you have given yourself up to it, you will find yourself unable to think of anything else."

That is morality. "Blessed are the pure in heart," says Jesus Christ; "for they shall see God." That is religion.'—MATTHEW ARNOLD.

'When he said "Be free," they cheered him to the echo; when he said "Be pure," the effect was very different.'—MRS. OLIPHANT, of Savonarola and the Florentines.

Mt 5⁹ 'The Lord does not use me, like His servant Dr. Chalmers, for great things, but my way of serving the Lord is walking three or four miles to quiet a family dispute.'—A. A. BONAR.

Bunyan died from the effects of a cold caught during a journey undertaken to heal a family feud between a father and son at Reading.

Mt 5^{10, 11}—

'If it prove a life of pain, greater have I judged the gain; With a singing soul for music's sake, I climb and meet the rain.'—ALICE MEYNELL.

In a letter to the *Westminster Gazette* (7th June 1904), 'an Old Liberal' declares that he can reproduce with absolute fidelity the purport and spirit of some words in a great speech of John Bright at the unveiling of Cobden's statue in the Bradford Exchange. "I remember," said the orator, "on the morning of my dear friend's funeral, I was standing beside his coffin, looking at that which contained all that was mortal of the man I had known so long. His daughter, who was in the room with me, said, 'My dear father was always very fond of the Sermon on the Mount.'" And then Bright's voice swelled and grew in depth and volume, as it was wont to do when he was deeply moved, and he went on, "And I think that my friend's whole life was a sermon upon that highest and holiest of all texts." He repeated, as only he could have done, the blessings uttered by the Divine lips upon the poor, the mourners, the meek, the hungerers after righteousness, the merciful, the pure in heart, and the peace-makers; and then, in his own severely simple words, summed up the labours of Cobden and his associates in a single phrase, "We tried to put Holy Writ into an Act of Parliament."

Mt 5¹⁶ Tolstoy, in his *Confession*, speaks of the faith and practice of orthodox believers in his own circle, men whose religious position was respectable, and whose manner of life in no way differed from the ambitious, vicious conduct of unbelievers like himself. 'No arguments were able to convince me of the sincerity' of such so-called believers' faith. 'Only actions, proving their conception of

life to have destroyed that fear of poverty, illness, and death, so strong in myself, could have convinced me; and such actions I could not see among them. Such actions, indeed, I saw among the open infidels of my own class in life, but never among its so-called believers.'

'Christ doth not say that others hearing your good works, your good story, or your pathological expressions; but that *others seeing your good works may glorify your Father*.'—JONATHAN EDWARDS.

Before men: 'The main point nowadays is to be pious in the open air.'—ROTHE.

'Let your light shine before men, and think them not unworthy the trouble.'—MARGARET GORDON to Carlyle:

'Good people shine from afar like the snowy mountain peaks.'—Buddhist Dhammapada.

Mt 5²⁰ 'Religious people do not see that the "irreligious" are "irreligious" because they demand much of religion, more than the religion of "religious people" have to give them.'—*Contemporary Review*, July 1898, p. 54.

'People have often tried to find a type of life that might serve as a basement type. . . . The type must be one discontented with society as it is.'—W. PATER.

Mt 5²⁸ 'But this is not the rule by which we are to judge our past actions, but to guard our future ones. He who has thoughts of lust or passion is not innocent in the sight of God, and is liable to be carried on to perform the act on which he suffers himself to dwell. And in looking forward, he will do well to remember this caution of Christ; but in looking backward, in thinking of others, in endeavouring to estimate the actual amount of guilt or trespass, if he begins by placing thought upon the level of action, he will end by placing action on the level of thought. It would be a monstrous state of mind in which we regarded mere imagination of evil as the same thing with action; hatred as the same with murder; thoughts of impurity as the same with adultery. It is not so that we have learned Christ. . . . However important it may be to remember that the all-seeing eye of God tries the reins, it is no less important to remember also that morality consists in definite acts, capable of being seen and judged of by our fellow-creatures.'—JOWETT.

Mt 5^{38f.} 'The present week is within what is ecclesiastically termed the Octave of St. John the Baptist. I wonder whether anyone who read first

the preachment of Count Tolstoy and then the leading article on it in the *Times* of last Monday, had the same thought about it that occurred to me. Was it a sermon of John the Baptist that I had just read, taken down by a reporter on the banks of Jordan for the *Times of Judæa*, and were these the comments of the Scribe or Pharisee who no doubt wrote the leading articles for that journal in the year A.D. 29? And was it not the same vigorous, sober, practical, and common-sensible writer who wrote that notable article (which made such a sensation a year or two later) about the Sermon on the Mount? I need not go beyond the Baptist for my illustration, but one can perceive how cogently the scribe would have pointed out the inability of that eccentric idealist clothed in camel's hair "to perceive, even dimly, the elementary facts which dominate the social and political order of Judæa, his intolerance of the men and the institutions upholding that order, and his powerlessness to suggest any working alternative for the system he would overturn." . . . How is it that there is this gap between the spiritual and the practice of mankind? I do not think that any reflecting person can have lived through a war without daily puzzlement over this, the deepest of the antinomies. But, after all, it is a problem which is with us in peace also; for war, which Tolstoy chooses for his example, is merely a heightened instance of the everyday antagonism between the ideal and the practical. If the Sermon on the Mount is fatal to war, it is fatal also to many of the operations whereby men get rich, or win the women they love, or pursue their own interests or those of their families. Man moves incessantly on two separate planes under mutually conflicting instructions, either of which he disobeys at his peril. The one is the physical law which decrees that the stronger shall prevail; the other the spiritual, which says that the meek shall inherit the earth. . . . The fighting, striving, eat-and-be-eaten life goes on simultaneously with the meek, spiritual religious life in different individuals and in the same individual at the same time.'

—*Westminster Gazette*, 2nd July, 1904.

Mt 5^{43f}.—

'He is a friend, who, treated as a foe,
Now even more friendly than before doth show;
Who of the very stones against him cast
Builds friendship's altar higher and more fast.'

—ARCHBISHOP TRENCH.

Mt 5⁴⁵ 'I am more and more clear about this, that we must be content to know that the best things come to us both from man and God, without our deserving them.'—DALE.

Mt 5⁴⁶ 'It would be a great step in advance for most of us to love anybody, and the publicans of the time of Jesus must have been a much more Christian set than most Christians of the present day; but that we should love those who do not love us is a height never scaled now except by a few of the elect in whom Christ still survives.'—*Mark Rutherford's Deliverance*, chap. iv.

Mt 6⁵.—

'He asketh not world's eyes;
Not to world's ears he cries;
Saith, "These
Shut, if ye please."'—FRANCIS THOMPSON.

Mt 6^{6f}. 'What indeed is prayer but love—love with a want?'—EUGENIE DE GUÉRIN.

Mt 6^{16f}. 'Fasting? Why, for a man who is trying to do his work in the best way, life is a perpetual fast.'—EDWARD THRING.

Mt 6²¹ 'The character of a man depends on that which is his confidence. . . . If you can persuade a covetous man that money is not *son bouclier ni sa grande récompense*, but that God is, you change him from a covetous man into a pious man. . . . The thing in which I put my confidence for happiness has necessarily a directing influence over my whole being; it communicates its own nature to me in some measure.'—ERSKINE of Linlathen.

Mt 6³³ *Seek first* . . . 'We forget that there may be many duties, but that among them all there is a first and a last, and that we must not fulfil the last before fulfilling the first, just as one must not harrow without ploughing.'—TOLSTOY.

'The whole of duty is modified when we change the hierarchy of duty. How significant is the etymology of "prerogative," the section that was asked first for its opinion! There lies the whole force of our ideal. *Which do you consult first?* Everything else will be different. . . . That which gives life its keynote is, not what men think good, but what they think best.'—JULIA WEDGWOOD.

Mt 7¹⁻⁵ 'I sometimes wonder whether people who talk so freely about extirpating the unfit ever dispassionately consider their own history. Surely one must be very "fit" indeed not to know of an occasion, or perhaps two, in one's life when

it would have been only too easy to qualify for a place among the "unfit."—HUXLEY.

Frederick Denison Maurice to his mother: 'Of all spirits I believe the spirit of judging is the worst, and it has had the rule of me I cannot tell you how dreadfully and how long. Looking in other people for the faults which I had a secret consciousness were in myself, and accusing them instead of looking for their faults in myself, where I should have been sure to find them all; this, I find, has more hindered my progress in love and gentleness and sympathy than all things else. I never knew what the words "Judge not, that ye be not judged" meant before; now they seem to me some of the most awful, necessary, and beautiful in the whole Word of God.'

'Have it a fixed principle that getting into any scornful way is fatal.'—BUSHNELL.

Mt 7⁶. See Julia Wedgwood's *The Message of Israel*, p. 304, and Dr. Hanna's edition of *Erskine's Letters*, p. 362.¹

Mt 7¹⁴ "The strait and narrow way" is an expression that gathers up the whole meaning of the life of this people. It is true even in a geographic sense, the rocky path which leads from Egypt to Assyria is the promised land of the chosen people. . . . Israel has been called to be the prophet among the nations, and life in the

¹ See also *Sacred Books of the East* (Oxford, vol. xxxv. p. 266) for the Buddhistic parallel: 'Let not this doctrine, so full of truth, so excellent, fall into the hands of those unworthy of it, where it would be despised, shamefully treated, ridiculed, and censured.'

present, for the prophet, is necessarily hampered and compressed within tiny limits.'—Miss WEDGWOOD, *op. cit.*, p. 56.

'I am suspicious of any religion that is a people's religion or an age's religion. Our Saviour says: "Narrow is the way."—NEWMAN.

Mt 7¹⁷ The spontaneity of life. 'When a man,' says Bacon, 'has proposed to himself the highest exemplars of noble words and virtues, "this done, he need not set himself, like a carver, to make an image, but let his better nature grow, like a flower."'

Mt 7²¹—

'And I remember still
The words, and from whence they came,
Not he that repeateth the name,
But he that doeth the will. . . .
Poor, sad humanity
Through all the dust and heat
Turns back with bleeding feet
By the weary round it came,
Unto the simple thought,
By the great Master taught;
And that remaineth still,
Not he that repeateth the name,
But he that doeth the will.'—LONGFELLOW.

'They call me a great man now, but no one believes what I have told them.'—CARLYLE.

Mt 7²⁹ 'The scholastic divinity which excites the antipathy of this delicate and charming spirit [the author of the *Imitatio Christi*] is that of the Realists and the Nominalists, that of Abelard and of William de Champeaux, the *scientia clamorosa* of the mountain Sainte-Genevieve, entirely occupied with definitions, genera, and species.'—RENAN.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

ACTS XIV. 17.

'And yet He left not Himself without witness, in that He did good, and gave you from heaven rains and fruitful seasons, filling your hearts with food and gladness.'—R.V.

EXPOSITION.

'And yet He left not Himself without witness.'—In speaking to peasants like those at Lystra, St. Paul naturally dwells most on the witness given through the Divine goodness as manifested in nature. In addressing philosophers at

Athens and at Rome, he points to the yet fuller witness of consciousness and conscience.—ELLICOTT.

'In that He did good.'—Notice the three participles, the second subordinate to and explaining the first, and the third the second: 'He gave witness of Himself by doing good,' that is, by giving rains, etc., 'in that way filling.'—PAGE.

'And gave you from heaven rains and fruitful seasons.'—This simple appeal to the principles of natural religion illustrates the care with which the apostles adapted their language to their audience. The description of the Creator is borrowed from the fourth commandment.—RENDALL.

THERE was peculiar propriety in this mention of rain; for, according to Strabo, the pastures of Lycaonia, a region in which the streams from the surrounding mountains do not form rivers of any importance, were liable to suffer severely from drought, and in one of its cities water cost more than milk, in consequence of the unusual depth to which it was necessary to sink the wells.—COOK.

It was in fact this form of the bounty of God which gave birth to religious festivals. For they began when men met together and in feasting and gladness expressed their gratitude for the fruits of the earth, for harvest or for vintage.—RACKHAM.

'Filling your hearts with food and gladness.'—*εὐφροσύνης*, gladness. Specially used in Greek of the cheerfulness which attends a banquet.—PAGE.

WITH the 'natural religion' of this summary of Paul's address compare and contrast that of his address at Athens—each so perfectly adapted to its audience. Everyone who has studied pagan religion, *e.g.* as seen in the modern mission field, knows how largely it is concerned with material benefits. Hence Paul's words were well adapted to lead up to the idea of a 'living God' of nature.—BARTLET.

THE SERMON.

God's Witnesses.

By the Very Rev. C. J. Vaughan, D.D.

These two chapters—the 13th and 14th of the Acts—give us specimens of the way in which the gospel addresses itself to all manner of states and conditions of men. The Apostle has his suitable word of conviction alike for the Jewish audience trained in the Scriptures and the heathen mob sunk in superstition.

A journey of about ninety miles has brought the two Evangelists from Antioch to Iconium. There they seek the synagogue and preach *Christ the end of the Law*. Many believed, but persecution followed quickly upon success. The apostles were despitefully used by both Jews and Gentiles. So, remembering their Master's command, they carried their message to another city.

The site of Lystra is not known, but this little chapter in its history is familiar to all: how the poor cripple who never had walked was made to stand upright in the market-place by the word of Paul, and all the consequences of that wonderful miracle on the Apostle's heathen audience. It was when Paul discovered that these idolaters thought that he was Jupiter, and Barnabas Mercury, and meant to receive them with Divine honours, that he protested and plied them with arguments drawn from *natural religion*. 'Sirs, we also are men, preaching to you that ye turn from

these vain things to a living God; who made all things: and who left not Himself without witness, giving you rain from heaven and fruitful seasons, filling your hearts with food and gladness.'

1. St. Paul says that *Nature* is God's witness. He writes to 'the Romans, 'the invisible things of God from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead.' And we too believe in the evidence of the things that are seen to the being of an invisible Creator. We look up to the starry sky and say—It must have had a Maker; and when we think of the mechanism of a human body, or the endowments of a human mind, and feel they owe their origin to some One, we give to that some One the reverence and worship of the thing made to the Maker of it.

2. *Providence* too is God's witness. The power which presides over the world and human life loves righteousness and hates iniquity. If you live morally and religiously, you will live, on the whole, happily. Act as if there were no God, holy and almighty, and you will live to curse the day when you first gave way to temptation. Sin finds us out. Great crimes are avenged by society, secret sins destroy health and undermine success, and even little sins make conscience a tormentor.

3. God has a witness in the *human conscience*. What is this strange thing within me which is at once I and not I; which says to me, '*This is the way, walk thou in it*'; and if I walk not in it, condemns me? I did not place it there, and I cannot dethrone it, though I may disregard it. May not the thing which I call conscience be designed to inform me that there shall be one day a *setting of the thrones*?

4. God has not left Himself without witness to you. If you cannot see His hand in Nature, you can see that there has been a hand over your life, inward and outward. He brought you into being, and has tenderly cared for you since. '*He left not Himself without witness.*' Witness to what? To the fact that there is a God, who is a God of truth, of holiness, and of love. The evidences we have spoken of are to make God known to man. '*This is life eternal, that they might know Thee.*' The full knowledge is through Jesus Christ. But there is a vestibule to the heavenly temple, and the heathen might penetrate thus far through the gate

of faith in a personal Creator, an individual Preserver, and all-just Judge.

God's Progressive Manifestation among the Nations.

By the Rev. Granville Ross Pike.

Human history becomes a hopeless tangle of clues that end abruptly, and of motives that lead to no result, unless we recognize that God has from the beginning been revealing Himself constantly to all nations: first, in a primary way, through the influence of nature and natural impulses; and later, by the fuller revelation of Himself given to the Hebrews, and then to all men by Christ.

On the obelisk of Tothmes III., who lived probably 2000 years before Christ, we find the belief in an all-ruling divinity clearly expressed. Mankind can never become a race of atheists. There is an indwelling religious conviction in the heart of every man. Whence got Buddha his purity, or Aristides his justice, or Epicurus his puritanical virtue, or Cicero his search after immortality, save from the same source as did Isaiah, or Samuel, or John the Baptist, or Paul?

All through the ages there has been progress in religious understanding: the Jews thought that sacrifices were most pleasing to God; with Jesus came the revelation that obedience was better. Christianity is the culminating point of all other religions, because it contains all their essential features. Man could find God symbolized in nature and could approach Him through it, because He had elected to reveal Himself there. But in Christianity there is a more direct means of communion. The revelation of God is fuller, and so the character of men is worthier. And this last is really the test by which Christianity has proved itself superior to all the pagan religions. It has the power of producing finer men,—not of influencing one man while the multitude plod on heedless, but of affecting the lives of all. Channing tells us that in his case Laotse, Zoroaster, Buddha, Plato, and Epictetus prepared the way—the end was Christ.

ILLUSTRATIONS.

His Witness.

I.

The works of God are fair for nought,
Unless our eyes, in seeing,
See hidden in the thing the thought
That animates its being.

II.

God sends His teachers unto every age,
To every clime, and every race of men,
With revelations fitted to their growth
And shape of mind, nor gives the realm of Truth
Into the selfish rule of one sole race:
Therefore each form of worship that hath swayed
The life of man, and given it to grasp
The master-key of knowledge—reverence—
Infolds some germs of goodness and of right.

—LOWELL.

Filling your hearts.—A farmer whose fields lay on the undulating slopes of the Cheviots—a man careless, earth-bound, sordid—was out early one spring morning, when the ploughs were in the furrow. In a hollow of the hills he found himself alone. All the hedgerows were quick and green. All the birds were singing. Soft white clouds moved across the sky like a procession of dancing children. Suddenly a thought smote him: 'Everything I see and hear is praising God—everything except *me*—I am not, I know not how.' It was the seed of the kingdom that had fallen into his heart from heaven:

God taught his heart
To bear its part,
And join the praise of spring.

—R. F. HORTON.

The first in time and the first in importance of the influences upon the mind is that of Nature. Every day, the sun; and after sunset, night and her stars. Ever the winds blow; ever the grass grows. Every day, men and women, conversing, beholding, and beholden. The scholar is he of all men whom this spectacle most engages. He must settle its value in his mind. What is Nature to him? There is never a beginning, there is never an end, to the inexplicable continuity of this web of God, but always circular power returning unto itself. Therein it resembles his own spirit, whose beginning, whose ending, he never can find—so entire, so boundless.—EMERSON.

All souls that struggle and aspire,
All hearts of prayer by Thee are lit;
And, dim or clear, Thy tongues of fire
On dusty tribes and twilight centuries sit.

Nor bounds, nor clime, nor creed Thou know'st;
Wide as our need Thy favours fall;
The white wings of the Holy Ghost
Stoop seen or unseen o'er the heads of all.

—WHITTIER.

FOR REFERENCE.

Cheetham (S.), *Mysteries, Pagan and Christian*.
Gibbon (J. M.), *The Children's Year*, 266.
Ketcham (W. E.), *Thanksgiving Sermons*, 147.
Lonsdale (J.), *Sermons*, 173.
Momerie (A. W.), *Defects of Modern Christianity*, 179.
Pike (G. R.), *Divine Drama*, 46.
Rawnsley (R. D. B.), *Village Sermons*, 161.
Vaughan (C. J.), *Church of the First Days*, 296.

Recent Biblical and Oriental Archaeology.

BY PROFESSOR A. H. SAYCE, LL.D., OXFORD.

Merodach.

MARDUK or Merodach, the god of Babylon, was identified by the Babylonians with A'sari-mur-dugga, the son of Ea, the culture-god of Eridu. As I have stated in my Gifford Lectures, the real origin of his name was lost, and a punning etymology endeavoured to explain it with the help of the two ideographs *amar* and *utu*, which were read *amar-utuki*, and translated 'the heifer of the goblin.' Support was found for the etymology in the fact that *amar-utu* would have signified 'the heifer of daylight,' and thus have corresponded with the astronomical name of Merodach in Sumerian, Gudi-bir, 'the ox of light.' It is possible that a Semitic etymology of the name was also sought in a common title applied to A'sari-mur-dugga in the magical texts of Eridu, Mar-Eridugga, 'the son of the Good City' Eridu. But all such attempts to find a derivation for the name were little more than puns.

I believe, however, that I can now suggest a more convincing etymology. A'sari-mur-dugga means 'the prince who does good to man,' as was first pointed out by Lenormant, whose rendering seems to me preferable on grammatical grounds to that of Hommel, 'the good man,' though the latter agrees better with the Egyptian title of Osiris, Un-nefer, 'the good being.' The Sumerian word for 'man' has long been misread; some years ago, however, I showed that on the early Babylonian seals the ideograph representing it was sometimes replaced by the character *ur*, and the newly-found fragment of the Babylonian legend of Gilgames informs us that in some instances its Sumerian pronunciation was 'sur,' while the dialectal form of the word was *mulu* or *mul*. *M* in Sumerian differed but little in sound from *w*, and *mu* consequently became *wu* and *u*; the character which denotes *mur*, for example, having also the value of *ur*. On the other hand, a vocalic termination was lost in neo-Sumerian, while *g* passed into *k* in borrowed Semitic words; thus *ê-gal*, 'great house,' or 'palace,' becomes the Assyrian *ekallu*, Hebrew *hêkâl*; *gur*, 'tun,' becomes *karru* or *karu*, etc. Hence A'sari-mur-dug,

'A'sari who benefits man,' could easily have become A'sari-Murduk, 'the Prince Murduk,' in Semitic mouths. Murduk, once admitted into the Semitic vocabulary, would soon have been 'Semitized' into Marduk, in accordance with the requirements of Assyrian grammar.

Noah.

In the *Actes du premier Congrès international d'Histoire des Religions*, ii. 2, Dr. Pinches has published a very useful and suggestive article on the Divine names which enter into the names of individuals found in contracts and other legal documents of the age of Khammurabi. There are two of these names to which I would more especially draw attention. One is Nakhum-Dagan, 'a resting-place is Dagan,' formed like Abum-ilu (the Abimael of Gn 10²⁸), 'a father is the god.' The Babylonian Nakhum is the biblical Noah, and there is a certain passage in the narrative of Genesis, the bearing of which, so far as I can see, has been persistently ignored by the commentators, which indicates that the name of Noah also once had attached to it the old Babylonian mimmatum. In Gn 5²⁹ the name is derived from the verb *nâkham*, thus implying that it terminated in *-m*. As such mimmatum forms go back to the early Babylonian period, and do not belong to the Assyrian age, the fact is an additional argument on the side of the view maintained by Professor Hommel in his *Ancient Hebrew Tradition*. Like the other names of the patriarchal epoch quoted by him, it will have been handed down from the Abrahamic age. Noah will originally have been Nakhum-(ilu), Nakhum-(Ea), or something similar, though the analogy of Jacob for Ya'kubu-ilu makes *ilu* more probable than the name of a specific divinity.

Gihon.

The second name to which I have referred is Ibi-Sakhan, 'proclaim, O Sakhan,' the determinative of divinity being prefixed to the name of the god. In the lexical tablets, 'Sakhan, as the name is there written, is given as a synonym of the Euphrates, and I have long had an idea that it is the original of the Gihon of Gn 2¹³. The

Hebrew Gihôn, the 'Stream,' is not known in Assyrian, and though there was a Sumerian word *gikhan*, meaning perhaps some kind of reed, which was borrowed by the Semitic Babylonians under the form of *gikhinnu*, it was never used of any of the Babylonian rivers. I would suggest, therefore, that the Hebrew *gikhôn* has been substituted for 'Sakhan in the passage of Genesis either by the original writer or by a copyist. The Gihon, we are told, 'compasseth the whole land of Cush' or the Kassî, the name under which the Babylonians were known in the age of the Tel el-Amarna tablets. What portion of the Euphrates, or which of the canals that flowed into it, was understood by the Babylonians under the name of 'Sakhan we do not at present know. I should mention that among the early Babylonian names collected by

Dr. Pinches are some compounded with the names of the deified rivers of the country; thus we have Mur-id-Edina, 'the man of the River of the Plain (Eden)'; Ibku-Idigla, 'the Tigris has given abundance.'

Ari.

Dr. Weissbach, in his *Babylonische Miscellen* (No. XI.), has published a syllabary from which we learn that the ideograph BUR-BUR, besides representing Uri or Ur, Assyrian Akkadû, and Tilla, Assyrian Urdhû or Ararat, also represented Ari, Assyrian Amurrû. Amurrû, the land of the Amorites, denoted Syria and Palestine, more especially the mountainous part of them, and in Ari I see a Sumerian (?) reproduction of the Canaanitish *har*, 'mountain.' Cp. Dt 17. 19. 20. 24.

Bishop Lightfoot and Professor Ramsay on Early Calendars.

BY THE REV. M. A. POWER, S.J., EDINBURGH.

PROFESSOR RAMSAY does me the honour of agreeing with me as to the date of the martyrdom of Polycarp, 155 A.D. I thought that some months ago he showed leanings to 166 A.D. By incurring the censure of Dr. Ramsay, I may be thought to have removed myself 'out of the ranks of regular progressive scholarship.' I do not think I have—but this is only an hypothesis of mine, and Dr. Ramsay is a little hard on my hypotheses. He calls on me to prove my theory of the 'great Sabbath' to the satisfaction of the 'authorities on that branch of study.' To begin with, I should be thankful to learn who these 'authorities' are. Will the Professor name one? For years I have been looking for them among Jews and Christians, and my diligent search has not yet been rewarded. There is no lack of writers on the technicalities of the Jewish Calendar. They range from the Mishnah and Maimonides to Cyrus Adler and Poznański, and from Clement of Alexandria to Dr. Margoliouth. Professor Ramsay will surely not expect me to mention Lightfoot in this connexion, nor yet the great 'authority' known as the *Jewish Encyclopedia*, which, in the article

'Calendar,' wisely or unwisely, shrinks from making the least reference to the difficulty of difficulties about the week-days eligible for the Passover. Of each and all of the scores of 'authorities' I have consulted, the Professor might write as he writes of my view on the 'great Sabbath': 'Mr. Power's theory must rank at present as one among many theories.' Quite so. The call for evidence where only hypothesis is accessible is like the cry of the child for the moon. Moonshine is all that he will ever get out of that luminary, and hypothesis is all that Dr. Ramsay can require from me or anybody else. If evidence were to be had, it would surely have been forthcoming from abler students than myself. I make no claim to have overleaped the misty bounds of hypothesis and to have passed into the cloudless region of evidence; and I am confident that Dr. Ramsay is equally modest. But in the use of my poor hypothesis, I have tried to follow an authority in logical methods, J. S. Mill. I have applied my view to ascertained facts, and it has not been found in conflict with them. Had it been otherwise, I should have frankly abandoned it. Had it been proved to be the only

rational explanation of the facts, I should have re-named my hypothesis and called it a 'proof,' without provoking the displeasure of Dr. Ramsay, I hope. But presuming that the Professor has looked up my references, is it quite fair, I ask, to level all distinctions of rank between hypothesis and hypothesis, and to call each of them 'one of many,' *sine addito*? Of two guesses, one may have something to recommend it,—the other, nothing. Will Dr. Ramsay criticise my criticism of Lightfoot's dogmatic utterance on the 'great Sabbath'? This is a pre-Christian Jewish phrase, and what in the name of Jewish liturgy has Lightfoot's Christian Easter to do with it? Before opening fire on my unoffending hypothesis, the Professor should have read the generous words from a well-known pen in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for June: 'It is by good guesses that progress is made, and we are content to take the misses with the hits.'

Worse than my respectful refusal to comply with the impossible request for evidence is my 'extraordinarily erroneous statement' regarding the number of days in the Asian month, Dius. 'A student of the Asian Calendar'—can that be myself?—is rated because he was ignorant that Dius contained 31 days. I am ignorant of it still. No Asian month of any Asian Calendar contained more than 30 days. I would ask Dr. Ramsay to avert his gaze for a moment from the object of his admiration and mine, the illustrious Bishop of Durham, and to turn to the pages of Fathers Strassmaier and Epping, S.J., on the Babylonian Calendar, Burnaby on the Mohammedan Calendar, the Jew Lindo on the Jewish Calendar, and the old Jesuit Petavius on all Calendars, Eastern and Western, in the great work *De Doctrina Temporum*, which Lightfoot would have done well to consult before committing himself to the 'extraordinarily erroneous statement,' commended by Dr. Ramsay as a 'fact,' that an Asian month was composed of 31 days. The alleged fact, we are further told, has been proved by Lightfoot 'in a perfectly convincing way.' After long and reverent study of Lightfoot, I must protest against a style of panegyric which is little better than a travesty of logic. If Dr. Ramsay will devote a little study to the works above named, together with Wolf's standard *Handbuch der Astr.*, he will find (1) that in all civilizations of the East the length of a lunation was determined with extraordinary accuracy, and

(2) that no early observers or calendar-makers so far departed from their scientific calculations as to give a month so large a number of days, that its relation with a lunation would be thereby seriously disturbed.

The very grave mistake made by Lightfoot, and copied too faithfully by Dr. Ramsay, is easily explained. I now repeat that through neglect of the elementary principle of the 'Brought Forward' day, explained in my last article (THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, April), Lightfoot has been led to attribute 31 days to Dius. His 'perfectly convincing way' may be put thus—

$$A + A + B + \Gamma + \Delta + \dots \Lambda (\tau\rho\iota\alpha\kappa\acute{\alpha}\varsigma) = 31 \text{ days.}$$

This is so, if we count the two *alphas* as falling fully within the numerical range of Dius. That they never so fell is clear from all the known calendars of Asia, especially the Babylonian and Jewish. On all principles of analogy, the above equation must be revised in this form—

$$[A. \text{ Brought Forward.}]$$

$$A + B + \Gamma + \Delta + \dots \Lambda (\tau\rho\iota\alpha\kappa\acute{\alpha}\varsigma) = 30 \text{ days.}$$

That Lightfoot has serious misgivings about the correctness of his own conclusion touching the alleged 31 days, is evidenced by a passage which shows that he was acquainted with the repugnance of Easterns to the number 31 as applied to a month. On lunar principles they were quite right. But how does the Bishop explain their objection? I am sorry to say in a most unconvincing and unscientific way, to which I invite Dr. Ramsay's attention. It would seem that the Asians had recourse to some tricky method of defrauding Dius of the 31st day. 'It seems to have been a superstition in these parts that the last day of the month should be *τριακός*, the 30th.' The theory of 'superstition' to account for a universal and fairly scientific process amongst Eastern astronomers is, I submit, utterly unworthy of the reputation of a great scholar. The *deus ex machinâ*, awarding a 31st day, stands confessed. The extra day, which was unknown to the Asians proper, though introduced afterwards by Asian Romanizers, is the somewhat discreditable creation of Lightfoot, and the champion who espouses his cause here, has taken on himself a heavy responsibility. When lecturing me on the necessity of giving proofs, Dr. Ramsay might cast an eye on another offender, who is perhaps in sorer need than I. Yet the 31st day is roundly stated by the Professor to be 'the

fact from which Mr. Power must start.' I really must decline the advice with thanks. The facts attached to all lunar reckonings in the East are more to me than the bare word of Lightfoot. I must again remind Dr. Ramsay that I am speaking of an Asian month in an Asian Calendar, and not of Græco-Roman inscriptions, nor of the special pleadings of Galen the Pergamene for Roman reform, nor of Romanizing influences which, after conquering continents, found it a fairly easy task to capture calendars, by the introduction of their solar methods; and their 31st day, and their lordly practice of adorning the old Asian months with titles such as 'Cæsar' and 'Tiberius.' This was well known before Dr. Ramsay came across the *Mittheilungen*, etc., for 1899.

That the Asian months were in places forced to take something like a Roman mould at the time of Christ and after, I do not deny, but I ask for proofs that the transformation was abruptly or completely effected. We know from the pages of Lecky how England stood out against the Gregorian reform, as Russia does still. Was the East less conservative? The Asian Calendar died hard. Josephus, who lived after Christ, always regarded Xanthicus, the month in which Polycarp died, as a strictly lunar month. How far the Romans failed to tamper with the calendary methods of Asia, is admitted by no less an 'authority' than Lightfoot himself: 'They [the Asiatic and Ephesine months] are a strict reproduction of the Julian Calendar, even to the retention of a month of 28 days, but with these exceptions: (1) the Epheso-Asiatic months commence 8 days before the corresponding Julian months; thus Dios, corresponding to October, commences September 23rd; Xanthicus, corresponding to March, commences February 21st; and so with the others. (2) The year commences not in mid-winter, but about the time of the autumnal equinox. (3) The months bear different names.'

This is a strange kind of 'strict reproduction.' One might as well say that, with the aid of a little letter-change and the free application of Grimm's Law, the name Gaius is a 'strict reproduction' of Cæsar.

Not more successful is Lightfoot's attempt to prove from inscriptions that the Asian Calendar, in the early Christian era, was entirely superseded

by the Julian. I simply ask Dr. Ramsay to say if the Lightfoot hypothesis is proved from Böckh's *Corpus* or from any other source. I note, in passing, that the stone-cutter who wrote *Εἰουλίον* (June) is corrected by Lightfoot and made to write *Εἰουλίον* (July). This will be a somewhat severe shock to Dr. Ramsay's belief in inscriptions, and what will the Jewish scholar, Dr. Steinschneider, say to it?

Something must be added about Lightfoot's appeal to Galen, the scientific champion of the superiority of the Roman methods of calculation. Galen has a strong case in favour of sun *versus* moon, and conducts it with marked ability. See the passage in *Medicorum Græc. Opp.*, vol. xvii. pars i. p. 21, ed. Kühn (1828). Lightfoot makes Galen say that 'all the Asiatic cities' prefer the sun to the moon as the ruler of months, but, like Wieseler and Kühn, he has misgivings about the reading *Ἀσιανῶν*, which is perhaps a corruption. Finally, siding with Ussher, he adopts it in preference to *ἀρχαίων*, as 'doubtless correct,' against Kühn, whose textual authority is as good as Lightfoot's. Then he goes on: 'It will be observed that Galen leaves no room for exceptions, when he classes all the Asiatic cities among those who use the solar calendar.' Is this reasoning, based on a passage that may be corrupt, 'perfectly convincing'? With some touch of compunction, Lightfoot proceeds to qualify his sweeping assertion: 'It seems tolerably certain that they had altogether discarded the lunar calendar. The term "Asiatics," however, must at all events comprise Proconsular Asia, whether we allow it a wider range or not. Ephesus and Smyrna would therefore be included not less than his [Galen's] native Pergamon.' Is this reasoning conclusive, I ask? It is strange that Galen, the loyal provincial, should be to the pains of indicating the grave disadvantages attendant on lunar methods and the immense benefits of the solar style of Imperial Rome, if he was preaching to a Proconsulate already converted to the latter. It is, I submit, unsafe to generalize from the words of Galen, especially as his *Ἀσιανῶν*, if he ever wrote it, appears as *Ἀσιανῶν ἡμετέρων* in *op. cit.* p. 23. And will Dr. Ramsay give us the 'many other nations' who, according to Galen, had discarded lunar for solar reckoning? The great physician protests too much. The substitution of sun for moon was a Roman feat, but it was not effected in a day. As the Romans captured the

Jewish horology, so they annexed the Asian menology, but they took their time about it. Xanthicus survived to Polycarp's day.

I am blamed for saying that the calendar he died under was not de-Asianized or Romanized

then. My assertion is such that 'no person is likely to spend time in refuting it.' Perhaps not; for time is precious, and, in Dr. Ramsay's eyes, I am no better than the folks in Juvenal—

Nos viles pulli, nati infelicibus ovis.

At the Literary Table.

THE ATONEMENT.

THE CHRISTIAN IDEA OF ATONEMENT.
The Angus Lectures for 1903. By T.
Vincent Tymms, D.D. (St. And.), Principal
of Rawdon College. (Macmillan. 7s. 6d.)

THE greatest books do not make the greatest sensation. This is the greatest modern book on the Atonement, but we know that it will be quietly received and quietly make its impression.

Dr. Vincent Tymms has been preparing all his life to write this book. He has read what other men have written on the Atonement. And he has kept himself acquainted with the thought which touches the Atonement on every side and from any distance. There is no quoting of recent books on the Atonement, no reference to authorities, or otherwise, in science. Dr. Tymms' knowledge of all the literature, scientific and theological, is seen in the ease with which he plants his foot on theological and scientific foundations, never stepping on a treacherous stone and never rejecting a steady one.

The doctrine of the Fall is probably the greatest difficulty at present to the dilettante in theology and science. Dr. Tymms says: 'The religious significance of the story does not depend upon any particular view of man's origin, because it represents a process which must have been experienced by the human race to bring it into the position it occupies to-day. Whether man reached the height from which a moral fall was possible by a momentary act of creation, which endowed him with adequate faculties and knowledge, or whether he reached it as the issue of immeasurable ages of evolution, the time arrived when he became capable of religious thought and feelings, and conceived the idea of One above, to whom he owed allegiance.'

But Dr. Tymms shows how great his book is, in

the place he assigns to Love. That word is the key to the Atonement. For in the Atonement the deepest difficulty is its date. It is not *Cur Deus Homo?* nor *Quomodo?* Not why did God become man, nor how did He make the Atonement? It is the time chosen for the Incarnation and the Cross. If God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself, why did He not appear in Christ till 'these last days'? The answer is in the nature of Love. All was done that we might love—the Creation, the daily providence, Calvary. But love cannot be hurried. Even God must wait on love. He did what He could. 'Judge, I pray you, betwixt me and my vineyard. What could have been done more to my vineyard that I have not done to it?' The husbandmen had to receive the messengers whom the Lord of the Vineyard sent to receive the fruits, and beat them and send them away empty, *before the Son could be sent.*

The clever debater answers, You are but pushing the difficulty back, not resolving it. Why was man made with a nature that depended on so shy a thing as Love? But there is an easy answer to that. It is because of the greatness of man. Man with a lower endowment than the highest is impossible, impossible for God to make, impossible for man to conceive. 'We love,' says John. It is the greatest saying ever uttered of us. 'We love because He first loved us,' is its only explanation. And how could He love us, exercising His own great heart on us, without endowing us with the capacity to return it?

Sing Christina Rossetti's chant of Love. If it is not in your hymnal, your hymnal lacks the purest expression of worship—

Love is all happiness, love is all beauty,

Love is the crown of flaxen heads and hoary;

Love is the only everlasting duty;

And love is chronicled in endless story,

And kindles endless glory.

THE PROBLEM OF SUFFERING IN THE OLD TESTAMENT. By Arthur S. Peake, M.A. (*Bryant*).—Professor Peake was true at once to ancient and to modern thought when he chose the problem of suffering as the subject of his Hartley Lecture. For it was the most insistent of all the perplexities that vexed righteous souls in antiquity, and it remains with us in all its insistence and perplexity still. Right in between the ancient and the modern world comes Jesus Christ, saying, 'Fear not, ye are of more value than many sparrows.' But the quiet simplicity of His words has not yet reached us. He stands looking back on the past, 'Not a sparrow has fallen to the ground without My Father'; looking forward to the future, 'Fear not therefore'; but He stands alone. We turn to-day and to the casual 'God be with you,' we say as bitterly as Gideon, 'If God be with us, why has all this evil befallen us?'

Professor Peake has chosen the Old Testament problem. But his eye is on Manchester. What solution did the Old Testament offer? Jesus Christ. What solution can be offered to the modern city with its sins and sorrows? Jesus Christ. And the more scientifically Professor Peake investigates the Old Testament problem, the fuller, clearer, more conquering is the answer, Jesus Christ. Professor Peake is thoroughly scientific. He is joyfully scientific. No book could be more faithful to modern Bible study, and yet no book could lift the Bible more unmistakably into the place of unique knowledge and comfort. A wide gulf separates Professor Peake's conception of the problem of suffering in the Old Testament from that of Dr. Guthrie. But no one who has got to Professor Peake's side would desire to cross to the other.

THE THEOLOGY OF THE REFORMED CHURCH. By the late William Hastie, D.D., Professor of Divinity in the University of Glasgow, (*T. & T. Clark*. 4s. 6d. net).—In a prefatory note, Professor Flint says, 'The Theology of the Reformed Church had early taken possession of Dr. Hastie's mind and heart, and it absorbed his interest more and more as the years went on. He confessed to have no higher nor other aim in all his theological work than to ascertain, vindicate, and apply anew the fundamental and essential principles which he regarded as those of our National

Church.' In this volume, which contains Professor Hastie's Croall Lecture, skilfully edited by one of his pupils and divided into chapters, the Reformed Theology is described in its fundamental principles with perfect fearlessness and perfect clearness. Dr. Hastie had a fine gift of language which never failed to fulfil its purpose. What he meant to say he said. We may not agree with his exposition of the Reformed Theology, we may not agree with the Reformed Theology itself—Professor Flint refuses to be bound to the 'metaphysical predestinarianism of Augustine, Calvin, or the Synod of Dort'—but we see what a master of the subject saw in it, and we feel that it was great enough to be the sustenance of a great and good man.

There is no subject of Bible interest on which it is so necessary to know what the Bible means as Holiness. The careful student of the Bible knows now that it does not mean what we mean. If we would face what the Bible means, so unequivocally expressed in some places, we should be startled at the incongruity of its meaning and ours. The difference has not been faced in a little book of perfect beauty and much truth, entitled *Holiness by Faith*, which has been published by the Religious Tract Society (rs.). It has not been faced by any of the writers of that little book, neither by Bishop Moule, nor Mr. Brooke, nor Dr. Elder Cumming, nor Mr. Meyer. And the reason why they have missed the difference is that they have denied themselves any training in Comparative Religion. Would they lose something if they faced the fact that in the Old Testament holiness has sometimes nothing to do with right living, if they faced the fact that sometimes it just touches (what is a common meaning of holiness in some religions) the worst kinds of wrong living? Their little book is further described as 'A Manual of Keswick Teaching.' Would 'Keswick teaching' suffer if it were scientific? Perhaps the word 'scientific' is out of favour in Keswick. Let us say truthful, then—true to truth. It is to be true to truth to acknowledge that in the Old Testament there is a development of the doctrine of holiness, just as there is (and because there is) a development of the doctrine of God. And that to seek by faith to conform to the Old Testament doctrine of holiness regardless of this development cannot be to conform in all points to the mind of Christ.

Are we hostile to Keswick then? God forbid. There can be no holiness but by faith. It is our love of Keswick, our love of the men who teach 'Keswick teaching,' that moves us to say, Do not ask men to seek after a holiness which is partly out of Christ; do not think that holiness ever is or ever can be anything other than to love the Lord our God with all our heart, and our neighbour as ourself. Do not permit us to forget that he who loves not his brother whom he has seen, loves not God whom he has not seen.

Immortality is the brief title of five and twenty chapters of writing by the late Dr. A. W. Momerie, published for a sixpence by Mr. Allenson. Mrs. Momerie writes a preface of vehement vindication—calling him 'ideal Husband, devoted Lover, Friend, Companion, Protector, Support.' Somebody has been gathering statistics to prove that people do not want immortality. Stranger thing than that is the necessity, in this year of the Resurrection of Christ, for five and twenty chapters of writing to prove the fact of it.

Messrs. Bagster have issued a third revised and corrected edition of Professor Sayce's *Elementary Grammar of the Assyrian Language* (5s.). It needs no recommendation now. The best introduction to Cuneiform, it is built on thoroughly scientific principles, a model for all grammars and all grammarians.

There is now no edition of the New Testament in Greek for ordinary daily use that can compete with Professor Nestle's. The British and Foreign Bible Society has issued the latest recension. There are two forms of it, one with and one without critical apparatus. Both are so accurate that Matthew Arnold's rude saying, 'Miracles do not happen,' is made foolish.

THE BURNS COUNTRY. By Charles S. Dougall, M.A. (*A. & C. Black*. 6s.).—Messrs. Adam & Charles Black have run ahead of all the publishers in a line that seemed exhausted. They have sent men to explore and describe certain lands and localities, they have sent artists with them to illustrate the writing. And they have combined the best scientific description so skilfully with the best artistic drawing, that the casual reader even has cast all his other 'guides' away,

and sat down with delight to the 'Scott Country,' the 'Ingoldsby Country,' or (in the case before us) the 'Burns Country.'

Through Messrs. S. C. Brown, Langham, & Company, the Rev. James Adderley has published *Notes on The Epistle of St. James* (1s. net). Mr. Adderley is our own modern St. James. Do not miss his *Notes*.

One of the successful preachers to preachers is the Rev. Francis Bourdillon, M.A. His sermons always sell. They sell out. He reprints the few that are to live on, he lets the rest lie. *Short Sermons* he calls the new volume of reprints (S. C. Brown; 3s. 6d.); but we assure you their virtue is not all in the 'Short.'

THE BIBLICAL ILLUSTRATOR. **THE PSALMS.** Vol. I. (*Griffiths*. 7s. 6d. net).—It is a long time since the last volume of 'The Biblical Illustrator' was published; we thought the end had come. But surely to leave the Psalter unillustrated would have been a loss. The Psalter is not to be left; it is to be handled with the fullness it deserves. This first volume covers only the first six and twenty psalms. Its method is unaltered. The same skill in selection, the same packed mass of building material on every page.

JEZEBEL: A DRAMA. By P. Mordaunt Barnard, B.D., Rector of Headley, Surrey (*Griffiths*, or from the Author. 2s. net).—In one way this at once reveals itself as no common attempt to turn a Bible episode into verse. The study of the text is the study of a scholar. No minute shade of better meaning is lost. And often the gain is permanent; fixed in a memorable phrase. But it is also a dramatic poem. There are three acts, distinct, momentous, rising in expectation. And the verses never halt. From first word to last, without a moment's weariness, we have read it. The last scene is a fierce encounter of ambitious selfishness between Jezebel and her daughter Athaliah. At last Athaliah turns fiercely on her mother, threatens to strike her dead if she stands in her way, and departs to rule in Jerusalem. Jezebel speaks—

Ye gods of heaven! Oh, send me some relief!
I am distraught: hear me, ye gods of hell!
If I have served you well, then hear my prayer.

Look on the outrageous monster I have bred;
 Fulfil on her my curse. Let her be damned
 In tortures beyond thought; to hideous crimes
 Impel her on, that she may reap all woes
 That earth, and sky, and heaven, and hell can yield.
 Raise her up high, that she may deeper fall,
 And fall; and falling, taste the bitterest dregs
 Of the brimming cup of blood filled by herself.
 Let ghastly faces haunt her day and night
 Of infants, murdered to build up her throne,
 Of bleeding corpses formed, where queen of death
 She reigns in anguish. Make her mother's curse,
 Unheard in life, ring in her dying ears.
 Let her not die the pleasant death of one
 Who bravely falls beneath a foeman's sword,
 But slay her by the hands of those she wronged,
 That she may reap the fruits of villainy.

SACRED BOOKS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. THE BOOKS OF KINGS. By Bernhard Stade, Ph.D., D.D., and Friedrich Schwally, Ph.D. (Leipzig: *Hinrichs*. M.18).—It is a considerable time since the last volume of the 'S.B.O.T.' was published. This is the thickest volume of the series as yet issued, and it must have cost the most labour. Besides Stade and Schwally, the general editor himself has had a frequent hand in it. His paragraphs, marked 'P. H.' and placed within square brackets, are as luminous and useful as any of the work. For Dr. Haupt is more than a student of the Hebrew text, he is abreast of the whole range of Hebrew scholarship.

One observes with satisfaction that, numerous as the emendations are, the text is not rewritten after Dr. Cheyne's manner. Indeed, the absence of reference to Dr. Cheyne's work is a severe reproof. 'Klost,' 'Kamph,' 'Benz,' 'Kittel,' and 'Burney' occur constantly, and their suggested emendments receive respect. But we have only once come across a reference to Dr. Cheyne. The text of Kings is corrupt, but it may be emended, and the sense is never seriously altered.

Yet the work is done with thoroughness. Not a word, not a letter is missed. As a basis for exegesis nothing could be more valuable. It is a long time since Professor A. B. Davidson said that the beginning of work on the Bible was with its text. It is only now that his advice is being taken to heart. No commentator on Kings will be worth looking into who does not know and use Stade and Schwally.

The Jewish Literary Annual for 1904 (Hyamson, 102 Grosvenor Road, Highbury; 1s.) is up

to date. It is up to date in matters Jewish, and in annual-making. That is to say, it contains all we need to know about Jewish literature, and it may all be read with ease as an ordinary book. In eight and a half pages Professor Gollancz starts much thinking about 'Literature and Race.' But the most entrancing thing is Mr. A. M. Hyamson's own bibliography of the Jewish literature of the year.

THE BIBLICAL VIEW OF THE SOUL. By the Rev. G. Waller, M.A. (*Longmans*. 7s. 6d. net).—Mr. Waller, working on Taylor's *Hebrew Concordance*, has gathered and classified all the passages in which *nephesh* 'soul' occurs in the Old Testament. He has also given the Greek, Latin, and English renderings. And then he has drawn conclusions. The New Testament is similarly handled. So that the volume is a complete guide to all that, according to Scripture, the soul is and is to be.

CHRIST. By S. D. Mc'Connell, D.D., LL.D. (*Macmillan*. 5s. net).—The title is a bold one. And it is inappropriate. This is much more than Christ and much less. But Dr. Mc'Connell is not afraid of startling titles. 'The Inhuman Christ' is the heading of one of his chapters. He has a purpose in writing his book. He would protest against Atonement. Sacrifice is abhorrent to him. Every 'penalty paid' is a disgrace to God. And he does not tremble before great names. 'Augustine, Anselm, Calvin, Luther, these are great names. They have laid their hands upon the souls of millions, dead and living. Honestly believing that they were preaching Christ, they have propagated a gloomy paganism, which has gone far to render the cross of Christ of none effect.' St. Paul also, in his latest speeches, preached sacrifice, and in so far was wrong with the rest. So it is an uncompromising protest, wholly in the modern spirit, not wholly after the mind of Christ. We have not yet understood the word 'Ransom,' but it is there.

THE FAITH OF A CHRISTIAN. By a Disciple (*Macmillan*. 3s. 6d. net).—It is proper for every man to be able to give a reason for the hope that is in him, but it is not necessary that he should print it. We have read this 'reason' with care, and found it comfortable, orthodox, and

clearly stated. We have also found it a little wearisome. The author is not to be congratulated. His Faith is too safe. It is mainly an intellectual Faith, which is so rarely safe and comfortable, but he is the less to be congratulated on that account. There is no safe solution of suffering by the intellect; the only solution is through love, and that comes as the last attainment of noble minds. 'A Disciple' has thought a good deal in a comfortable way, but he has been too content with reasons. Reasons are little use to others and very dangerous to one's self. The use of the book lies in the clear and convincing way it has of removing superficial pseudo-scientific difficulties out of the way.

Charles Kingsley is still alive. One more edition by his faithful grateful publishers, and an edition that a lover of books like Charles Kingsley would have rejoiced over. *Westward Ho!* comes in two beautifully-printed easily-handled volumes, bound in the newest shade of green leather, and only 2s. 6d. net each. His publishers are Macmillan.

The last of Messrs. Macmillan's monthly list is the latest volume of the new Thackeray—*Travels in London, Letters to a Young Man about Town, and other Contributions to Punch* (3s. 6d.).

The Song of Solomon as Murray M'Cheyne preached it? Yes, it may be found again in *Joined to the Lord* (Marshall Brothers), by Annie W. Marston.

In the days when we follow Todd's *Student's Manual* we resolve that we will keep a commonplace book and write down in it all the fine things which we come across in our reading. And some of us seem to keep that resolve. Mr. Alfred Sindall has kept it. In *A Treasury of Wisdom* (Melrose, 2s. 6d. net, and very attractive in appearance) he has selected and published the wisest and wittiest of all that his commonplace book contains. For instance—

SEEKERS AFTER LIGHT.

I know not if 'tis wise or well
To give all heathens up to hell—
Hadrian—Aurelius—Socrates
And others, good and wise as these;
I know not if it is forbid,
But this I know—Christ never did.

Gleim (German).

THE SHAIKHS OF MOROCCO. By T. H. Weir, B.D., M.R.A.S. (Edinburgh: *Morton*. 6s. net).—Now who cares for the story of the Shaikhs of Morocco? And why should Mr. T. H. Weir publish a book about them? We know Mr. Weir as a keen Old Testament student. His writing we have found accurate and incisive. We looked for students' books from him, and all on the study of the Bible. But the student of the Old Testament to-day must be a student of religion. It was an inevitable step from Hebrew to Arabic, it was an easy step from Moses to Morocco.

When he took the step Mr. Weir discovered Ibn Askar—'a Moorish Boswell, a Jocelin of Brake-lond, credulous and conscientious, and not hesitating to exalt his heroes at his own expense'—and we have not lost ourselves so contentedly in a book of any kind for a while. No doubt, as Professor Robertson in his preface says, it is more than a book of idle tales, it is the rare revelation of a nation's thinking and religion. But that comes as sauce to the food, which is just sheer delight in the untrodden paths of men and their unfamiliar ways. Certainly it is history, and purer history than Scott's *Ivanhoe* contains. But it is not for the history we revel in it, it is for the unsuspecting play of humanity before us—tragedy and comedy, laughter and tears.

THE TEACHING OF THE GOSPEL OF JOHN. By J. Ritchie Smith (*Revell*. \$1.50 net).—The Presbyterian Churches of America have been slow in admitting critical methods, but they are admitting them. Their caution enables them to use what they do admit. There is no 'critical period' in their history. They are always reading St. John for edification. Mr. Ritchie Smith uses criticism sparingly, but he uses it. And he is alive to the possibility that it may yet be used more freely. So he does not shut the door. His exposition of St. John's doctrine is for present use in the pulpit or in the life, and he is careful to stand on critical ground which the early future is not likely to shake. His book makes a good impression. St. John is felt to be a rich mine of spiritual wealth; and when Mr. Ritchie Smith digs out the gems and gold and presents them singly, they are still found to be genuine, more valuable indeed for the separating. It is a safe, instructive handbook of the Johannine theology.

THE MODERN CRISIS IN RELIGION.

By George C. Lorimer (*Revell*. 3s. 6d. net).—This is not the title of the first sermon in the book, it is the title of the book. Dr. Lorimer believes that we have let things drift till we are face to face with a crisis. We can let them drift no longer. In the cities, ministers have let amusement and intemperance thin their churches; in the country, ministers have let their people drop off through sheer dulness and sloth. It cannot go on, says Dr. Lorimer. If it goes on, the churches will be empty; America will be a pagan land again.

Dr. Lorimer's remedies are good. He tells the country minister to put more life into his sermons and himself; he tells the city minister to denounce amusement and intemperance and take the consequences. But in all this matter we know the right already. Let Dr. Lorimer lead us. It is example we want. We hate to be singular. Make drink-denunciation popular, and we shall all denounce drink.

The sermons are right pleasant reading. Was that what they were written for?

THE PHILIPPIAN GOSPEL. By W. G. Jordan, B.A., D.D. (*Revell*. 3s. 6d. net).—The Professor of Old Testament Exegesis in Queen's University is one of the most accomplished scholars and ready writers in Canada. And the scholars and writers in Canada are now taking their place in the scholarship and literature of the world. Professor Jordan's last book, *Prophetic Ideas and Ideals*, discovered a sense of the meaning of prophecy and of its modern use. His new book is on the same lines. Its sub-title is 'Pauline Ideals.' What were the thoughts which moved and made the Apostle to the Gentiles? What were, not the kind of shoes he wore, the kind of linen his handkerchiefs were made of, but the ideas he carried from place to place and turned the world upside down with, the ideals he had of the life here and hereafter, which even he had not yet realized?

It is not an ordinary commentary on Philipians. It is a communion with the man who wrote Philipians.

Mr. Stockwell has published (1) a volume of sermons on some familiar hymns by the Rev. T. Gasquoine, B.A. (*Our Evening Hymns*, 2s. net); (2) a volume of direct emotional sermons

by the Rev. Alfred Clegg (*The Throne and the Voice*, 2s. 6d. net); (3) a second edition of the Rev. Joseph Pearce's *Alabaster Box* (2s. net); and (4) an old English story, *Dudley Castle*, by Chris. G. Gardner.

Another commonplace book. So many excellent men who have kept their youthful and excellent resolutions. This time it is the late Rev. Russell Wing, M.A. The selection is made by the Rev. Warden F. Stubbs, M.A. The title is *Some of Life's Gleanings*, and the publisher is Mr. Thynne (2s. net).

'Christ does not save the world through syllogism, but there are moments when syllogism counts.' The apothegm will be recognized as Canon Scott Holland's. He introduces in that way a book by Walter J. Carey, M.A. (Wells Gardner; 6d. net and rs. net), on *The Reasonableness of Christianity*. We should be ready to recommend it less sententiously but more enthusiastically.

Messrs. Watts have published this month for the Rationalist Press Association (1) *A Modern Zoroastrian*, by Samuel Laing; and (2) *Ethics of the Great Religions*, by Charles T. Gorham (6d. each). The misapprehension of Christ in the latter book is due to sheer shallowness of thought. That a man should be encouraged to publish, who hints that Christ was indulgent towards sexual impurity, is a sign that Rationalism is one thing and Reason another.

FAITH AND MORALS. By Wilhelm Herrmann, D.D. (*Williams & Norgate*. 5s.).—Messrs. Williams & Norgate have offered nothing in their 'Crown Library' more acceptable than this. Herrmann is even yet known only to the fewest of the few in this country. It was just a popular, easily attainable book like this that we needed to let his personality and piety make their impression. Besides, the contributions herein made to the Christian doctrines of Faith and Morals are of abiding value. And so fine is the spirit, so lucid the expression, that no one will care to ask, 'Wherein do I disagree?' all will be glad to acknowledge that they have learned much.

The Rev. Alexander Patterson, though an American, is not content with Evolution. All his

friends are living as if it were sure as gravitation: he disputes every step in the argument it rests upon. And he is not a fool. He knows science enough not to make a fool of himself. He has weighty reasons in religion and morality. Modestly he calls his book *The Other Side of Evolution*. It is published in Chicago by the Winona Publishing Company.

THE OLD TESTAMENT DOCTRINE OF SALVATION. By W. D. Kerswill, M.A., D.D. (*Pres. Board of Publication*).—It has been said elsewhere in one of these reviews that the chief difficulty about the Atonement is its date. Professor Kerswill sees that. If there is no other name given under heaven among men whereby we

must be saved, were all the nations of the ancient world lost? If they were not lost, how were they saved? We are selfish even in our salvation. What are the nations of antiquity to us? Dr. Kerswill shows that we do not know what salvation is, and presumably have not got it, if we do not know how the men and women who lived B.C. were saved. Well, how were they saved? By the working of God's Spirit in men's hearts. God left not Himself without witness, and there was a more convincing witness than the rain from heaven and fruitful seasons, there was a Spirit always striving with men, and that Spirit was Christ. When the Word became flesh, the salvation and the responsibility were greater, but they were not new.

Contributions and Comments.

The Woe on Chorazin, Bethsaida, and Capernaum.

AN old Christian tradition is that the Antichrist shall be of the tribe of DAN; according to the *Jewish Encyclopedia* (article 'Antichrist,' i. 627), it is probably connected with the Jewish conception of the Messiah, that He would be derived from that tribe on the maternal side (*Gen. R.*, xlviii.; see also Zohar, *Balak*, 194b). A very interesting specification was given to this tradition by the so-called *Pseudo-Methodius*, that the Antichrist would be born at Chorazin, educated at Bethsaida, and rule at Capernaum, and that therefore Christ cursed these cities. See the edition of *Pseudo-Methodius* in ERNST SACKUR, *Sibyllinische Texte und Forschungen* (Halle, 1898, p. 93): '... apparebit filius perditionis. Hic nascitur in Chorozaïm et nutrietur in Bethsaidam et regnabit in Chaparnaum et letabitur Chorozaïm, eo quod natus est in ea, et Bethsaida propter quod nutritus est in ea, et Chaparnaum ideo, quod fegnaverit in ea. Propter hanc causam in euangelio Dominus tertio sententiam dedit, dicens: Ve tibi Chorozaïm, ve tibi Bethsaida et tibi Chaparnaum, si usque in celum exaltaveris, usque ad infernum descendes.'

Why the Third Gospel is quoted by this author (Lk 10^{13, 15}) and not the first (Mt 11^{21ff.}) I do not know. Neither is the Greek original of this in-

teresting work at my disposal. An allusion to this explanation is found in the pilgrimage of Oliverus (about 1211, published in vol. ccii. of the *Literarische Verein*, Stuttgart): Corozain, in qua nutrietur Antichristus, seductor orbis, unde illud: Ve tibi Bethsaida, ve tibi Corozain.'

As the *Dictionary of the Bible* says on Chorazin, that beyond a meagre notice in the Talmud the place has no history, this tradition on it may be published here. The *Jewish Encyclopedia* omits the article Chorazin altogether. EB. NESTLE.

Maulbronn.

The Homily of Pseudo-Clement.

THIS note is an abstract of an article published in No. 56 of the *Journal of Philology* (1903). The *Epistle* referred to is that of St. Clement of Rome to the Corinthians. The *Homily* is the writing which used to be called his Second Epistle.

1. *Sources of the Homily*.—The preacher's free way of using his materials is strikingly illustrated by his adaptations of He 12¹ in *Hom.* i. 6, vii. 1-3. As a Gentile he would doubtless have known the story of the Choice of Hercules in Xenophon's *Memorabilia*, which Justin Martyr quotes in the name of Xenophon; and allusion is perhaps made to it in *Hom.* vi. 1-5, x. 1. Reasons are given for

thinking that he also used *Cebetis Tabula* in the same free way as He 12¹. Pre-Bryennian editors adduced as relics of the lost ending of the *Homily* two fragments, one of which (not found in the complete text) is in substance an epitome of the epilogue of the *Tabula*. The article gives a fresh conjectural emendation of *Hqm. x. 3*, οὐκ ἔστιν εὐρεῖν ἄνθρωπον οἴτινες κ.τ.λ.

2. *The Early Evidence for the Homily*.—Lightfoot, in his first edition of the *Epistle* and the *Homily* (1869), adopted the hypothesis that 'Clement towards the close of the epistle dwelt upon the end of all things, the destruction of the world by fire. . . . And for this statement he appealed to the authority, not only of the apostles and prophets, but also of the Sibyl' (pp. 8, 166 f.). This rested upon pseudo-Justin's *Respons. ad Orthodox.* 74, with the doubtless corrupt ending, ' . . . as say the Scriptures of prophets and apostles, and moreover of the Sibyl, as saith the blessed Clement in the *Epistle to the Corinthians*,' etc.

According to Usher, pseudo-Justin meant the *Homily*; but Cotelier gave a reason for thinking that he meant the *Epistle*. Irenæus, in a passage of which the conclusion is extant in the Latin only (iii. 3. 3), describes the *Epistle*, which he calls the Epistle of the Church in Rome to the Corinthians, as announcing one God, 'qui ignem praeparaverit diabolo et angelis ejus.' Cotelier inferred that this final conflagration, and also the Sibyl as an authority for it, were doubtless mentioned at the end of the *Epistle*. In reply to Usher, who contended that the Sibyl could not have been mentioned there, Cotelier suggested as a possible reading in pseudo-Justin, 'and as saith the blessed Clement in the *Epistle*.' . . . Thus we get rid of Clement's supposed allusion to the Sibyl.

In his *Appendix* (1877), Lightfoot came round to the view of Usher, that pseudo-Justin referred to the *Homily*. See also the enlarged second edition, 'by the late J. B. Lightfoot' (1890), where his final conclusions are set forth as follows:—

(a) On Cotelier's quotation of Iren. iii. 3. 3, it is said that the description agrees with the contents of the *Epistle*, except the clause 'qui ignem prae-paraverit diabolo et angelis ejus.' The insertion of a statement so remarkable 'could not have been an accidental error on the part of Irenæus.' This is repeated in the second edition from the first, where it had been concluded that Irenæus must have been quoting the lost ending of the *Epistle*.

(b) 'Still constructive criticism has failed here. . . . We have every reason to believe that we now possess the genuine *Epistle* complete, and the passage to which pseudo-Justin refers is not found there. When the edition of Bryennios appeared, the solution became evident.' The allusion was to the *Homily*.

Thus Irenæus, who was reasonably assumed to have referred to the same writing of Clement as pseudo-Justin, is now passed over, and nothing more is said about his 'qui ignem praeparaverit,' etc. Satisfied with the solution, which was 'evident' so far as related to pseudo-Justin, Lightfoot omits to justify or revise his statement about Irenæus, unless in (a) we are simply to read *was for could not have been*. In his later *Apostolic Fathers*, in one volume (ed. Harmer, 1891), he writes of the *Homily* as first attributed to Clement by Church Fathers in the fourth century.

The most obvious solution seems to be that Irenæus, like pseudo-Justin, referred to the *Homily* under the name of 'The Epistle.' There is no lack of parallel cases in which, when there are two Epistles, a writer quotes one of them as if there were one only.

C. TAYLOR.

Cambridge.

The Student's Hammurabi.¹

READERS OF THE EXPOSITORY TIMES do not need any introduction at this time of day to the personality of Hammurabi. Everybody has heard now of the Babylonian lawgiver who lived centuries before the age of Moses; many know that he is popularly identified with Amraphel, the contemporary of Abraham; and not a few are probably acquainted with the contents of the code of laws which the Rev. C. H. W. Johns was the first to make accessible to English students. Other English translations have since appeared, one by Mr. Boscawen, and another from the capable pen of Dr. T. G. Pinches. Clearly the Code has come to stay. It has been accepted by the Assyriologists and recognized by the theologians; and whatever view may be taken of its bearing upon the Laws of Moses, no one can deny that the study of the latter has become more fascinating through the

¹ *The Code of Hammurabi, King of Babylon, about 2250 B.C.* By Professor R. F. Harper, Ph.D. Vol. i. Luzac: London, 1904.

light which M. de Morgan's welcome discovery has thrown upon it.

The publication of yet another book dealing with *Hammurabi's Code* will occasion no surprise. There are many syntactical and exegetical details which require the most careful treatment. The meaning of the laws, on the whole, is perfectly clear, but there are a number of doubtful points which remain to be settled. Fortunately, we may feel pretty confident that the future, with its increased store of Assyriological knowledge, will solve these problems; would that we could assure ourselves that the difficulties which confront the biblical student would, too, in their turn disappear! For some time past it has been known that Professor R. F. Harper was preparing an edition of the Code, and those who have looked forward to his work will not be disappointed. In this, the first volume, we have the copy of Father Scheil's Babylonian text, which has already been published in the *A.J.S.L.*, October 1903, with transliteration and translation. The student will welcome the lists of proper names, signs, numerals, and complete glossary; to the ordinary reader, especially, the comprehensive index of subjects covered by the Code will be a useful guide. This edition may be styled 'The Student's *Hammurabi*.' It forms a compact and handy volume, which will serve as a helpful introduction to the study of Babylonian texts; and to every student of Assyriology the concise arrangement of its contents and the fullness of its information should make it a constant companion.

The second volume of the work, which will deal with the comparative study of the Babylonian and Old Testament legal literature, is being prepared in consultation with the author's brother, President W. R. Harper. It is the volume which will be awaited with greater keenness, and pending its publication it would be premature to raise questions which that volume will probably answer. Hence no one will complain of the scanty introductory matter or of the failure to mention other Old Babylonian laws, some of which doubtless found a place in the lacuna between §§ 65 and 100. No doubt a full discussion is reserved for the concluding volume. Nor need we examine more closely the laws where Professor Harper's translation differs from that of his predecessors. A careful and full study of the difficulties in the Code will be confidently looked for in the succeed-

ing work. Confining ourselves to the volume before us, we may, however, notice that the autographed text has been made from Father Scheil's photographic reproduction and not from the original monument, which is now added to the treasures of the Louvre. To what extent readings would be altered by a fresh collation is a matter for the Assyriologists to decide. Professor Harper himself remarks that an edition which is to be final must go back to the original.

The translation on the whole is rather literal; the Babylonian idiom has been retained in most cases, but for the sake of clearness the form of expression has been changed, where necessary. We have an example of this in § 42, where the negligent husbandman who has failed to cause the corn to grow in the field, is ordered to give 'grain on the basis of the adjacent (fields)'; here it is impossible not to prefer Mr. Johns' perfectly literal, quite intelligible, and almost biblical rendering, 'give corn like its neighbour.' Similarly at the end of § 170, Mr. Johns writes: 'The sons that are sons of the wife at the sharing shall choose and take'; Professor Harper's paraphrase, though legitimate, is less striking: 'The children of the wife shall have the right of choice at the division.' We note also in § 155 the correction 'throw *him*,' is tacitly adopted, and in § 150 the literal phrase 'to a brother' is retained, thus leaving it ambiguous whether it is the brother of the mother or of the child that is meant.

Enough has been said to show that Professor Harper's edition will confer a boon upon those who either have not Father Scheil's work, or who desire to have in handy form the complete text, transliteration and translation, with all that serves to make it intelligible. As a standard work of reference there is no doubt that it will long continue to be the most useful handbook for students.

STANLEY A. COOK.

*Gonville and Caius College,
Cambridge.*

The Beginnings of Monasticism.

THE Spirit which impels men to strive for the perfection of Jesus Christ has, under the pressure of various external circumstances, produced many ways of life which seem eccentric, but the Church has seen none so startling, so bizarre, as that of the

Egyptian and Eastern monks of the fourth century. To the superficial observer the life of a man like Macarius the Great is incomprehensible, and seems entirely remote from the ideals of the primitive centuries, and hardly nearer to the ordered moderation of Benedictine monasticism or the evangelical fervour of the early Franciscans. Yet the thoughtful student will not rest content with a philosophy which describes Egyptian monasticism as a sport, an accident with no root in the past and no influence on the future. Still less will he care to dismiss it from his mind as a degradation of the gospel spirit, a pagan kind of life masquerading in the dress of Christianity. He will want a history of the movement which will show whence it came and whither it went, what the life of the hermits was like, how they meditated, fasted, prayed; how they organized their communities, conquered their besetting sins, strove for righteousness; and above all, what the spirit was which animated them.

We are now within sight of the time when such a history may be written. During the last twenty-five years there have been published Coptic and Arabic documents hitherto unedited, and a number of competent scholars have been occupied in the criticism of these, and of the Greek and Latin sources of Egyptian monastic history. The story of this criticism is a strange one. It may be said to have begun with the publication of Weingarten's *Ursprung des Mönchtums* in 1877. His attitude towards such works as the *Vita Antonii*, the *Historia Monachorum*, and the *Lausiac History* was one of entire scepticism. They were fairy tales, romances, and no more to be regarded as historical than *Gulliver's Travels*. In 1882 he defended and emphasized his opinion in the article 'Mönchtum' in the second edition of Herzog's *P.R.E.* English writers accepted his conclusions and exaggerated his scepticism. But in Germany there were already signs of a reaction, though for a time Professor Zöckler stood almost alone in maintaining that the *Lausiac History* was entitled to some consideration as an historical document. In 1898 the reaction was complete. There were published in that year three books of first-rate importance—the *Prolegomena to the Lausiac History*, by Dom Cuthbert Butler; *Palladius u. Rufinus*, by Preuschen; and an *Étude sur le Cénobitisme Pachomien*, by Abbé Ladeux—and all three maintained the substantial reliability of the books which Weingarten had dis-

carded. The result appeared in the next edition of the Herzog *P.R.E.* (vol. xiii., 1903), where Grützmacher, writing the article 'Mönchtum,' feels it safe to ignore the negative criticism of his predecessor.

Since then Dom Butler has completed the work begun in his volume of *Prolegomena*, and given us the text of the *Lausiac History*.¹ His undertaking was one of enormous difficulty. In the first place, the question of redaction had to be decided. There was a long redaction, of which a Latin translation appears as 'Historia Lausiaca' in Rosweyde's *Vitae Patrum*, and a short redaction, first recognized as such by Dom Butler and Preuschen, of which the Greek was published by Meursius in 1616, and a Latin version in Rosweyde's appendix under the title 'Paradisus Heraclidis.' Dom Butler decided that the long redaction was interpolated, and that the Meursius text represented the genuine work of Palladius. This conclusion at once swept away many of the difficulties which had been felt by earlier critics in dealing with the *Lausiac History*. Then came the work of deciding the text of the short redaction. It became necessary to collate the various MSS scattered through the libraries of Europe, to group them, to compare them with the Latin, Syriac, and Coptic versions. So great were the difficulties, that it was not until May 1904, six years after the *Prolegomena*, that Dom Butler was in a position to publish his text. He is sincerely to be congratulated on his accomplishment. He has earned the gratitude of all students of monastic history by giving them the first reliable text of the work of Palladius. It may be amended in small points, but it is never likely to be either superseded or substantially modified. It is no exaggeration to say that this work takes its place among the great monuments of Benedictine scholarship, and will remain one of the books absolutely essential to the future historians of monasticism.

Besides his text and the introduction in which he has described his critical methods, Dom Butler has printed a number of very valuable notes and indices in his latest volume. With the help of

¹ *The Lausiac History of Palladius. Text and Studies*, vol. vi. No. 1, Prolegomena; No. 2, Text and Notes. By Dom Cuthbert Butler, M.A., Benedictine Monk of the English Congregation and of the Downside Abbey. Cambridge: University Press, 1898 and 1904. Pp. xiv, 297, and pp. civ, 278. Price 7s. 6d. net and 10s. 6d. net.

these notes the student is in a position to disentangle various perplexities which beset his path. For instance, great difficulties arise from the identity or similarity of the names of different monks. Dom Butler distinguishes no less than six who bore the name of Macarius. There were five called Moses, and six, with two bishops, who bore the name Sarapion. Amoun, the Nitriot, must be distinguished from Ammonas, Ammonius, Ammon who wrote the Ep. ad Theophilum, Ammon the abbot of a Pachomian monastery, and Cassian's Ammonas or Piammon. Perhaps the most valuable of all the notes is that which deals with the geography of monastic Egypt. Dom Butler has treated the subject very fully, giving on p. xcvi a map with a list of references to places marked. In note 14, p. 187, we have a discussion of the sites of certain famous localities. It is perhaps surprising to find Scete placed north-east of Nitria, but the passage quoted from Ptolemy must, I think, be regarded as conclusive in favour of this view.

By a curious coincidence, the fourteenth volume of the new edition of the *P.R.E.*, containing Zöckler's article 'Palladius',¹ appeared almost at the same time as Dom Butler's volume of text and notes. The article gives a succinct and able account of the criticism of the *Lausiaca History*, and expresses Zöckler's agreement with the conclusions arrived at by Dom Butler and Preuschen. Compared with the note on the book in *Askese u. Mönchtum*, this article affords a striking proof of the success of recent criticism in establishing the reliability of the book.

We are now in a position to appraise at their true value the main sources from which a history of Egyptian monasticism must be drawn. Ladeux' book establishes the position of the Greek and Coptic accounts of Pachomius and his monasteries. Dom Butler has settled the text and historicity of the *Historia Lausiaca*. Preuschen and others (especially Butler) have gone far to decide the questions which arise about the *Historia Monachorum*. The *Vita Antonii* takes its place as a work of St. Athanasius, and a reliable source of information on certain points. Sozomen's notes on the monks are traced to their sources. Abbé Nau has in preparation a critical edition of the *Apophthegmata*. It remains that certain monastic

rules which appear in Holstein under the names of Egyptian Fathers should be investigated. Then it will be possible for some one possessed of historical imagination, insight, and sympathy, to tell the world the story of one of the strangest and most attractive episodes in the history of Christianity.

Westport, Co. Mayo.

J. O. HANNAY.

'Anise' and 'Rue.'

IN Mt 23²³ Jesus urges against the Pharisees that they pay tithe of mint and *anise* or cummin. For 'anise' the R.V. has in margin: or, *dill*. In Lk 11⁴² he charges them that they tithe mint and *rue* and every herb. What is more likely than the identity of *anise* and *rue*, ἀνηθον and πήγανον? The botanical plants of course are not identical, nor are the Greek words; but now turn to the *Semitic original*, which must underlie the Greek. I seek the Greek words in the index of Löw, *Aramaicische Pflanzennamen* (1881), and am bidden to look for πήγανον, p. 371 f., and for ἀνηθον, p. 373. In § 317 Löw treats of שְׂפָרָא, *Peganum Harmala*, L., and in § 318 of שְׂבִתָּא, *Anethum graveoleus*, L. His book follows the order of the alphabet.

Can there be any doubt that Luke used a Semitic source and misread in it שְׂבִתָּא for שְׂפָרָא, just as in the preceding verse, according to the beautiful discovery of Wellhausen, he took וְכוּ as imperative Peal and translated 'give alms,' instead of the Pael 'cleanse'?

Under 'Rue' I read in the *Dictionary of the Bible*: It has been inferred from Lk 11⁴² that it was one of the plants subject to tithe (but see Plummer, *ad loc.*). The German commentaries are sadly deficient. As Luke in the same connexion replaces the κρίσις, ἔλεος and πίστις of Matthew, by κρίσις and ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ, he may have found the root רָחַם, not the word חָסַד, in his source. That one of the sources used by Luke was Semitic seems to be proved at last without a possibility of contradiction.

EB. NESTLE.

Maulbronn.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, St. Cyrus, Montrose.

¹ Article 'Palladius' in Herzog-Hauck *P.R.E.*, vol. xiv., by Professor O. Zöckler. Leipzig, 1904.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE miracles were first considered the chief defence of the Gospel, and then they were considered that part of the Gospel which most required defending. How does it stand with them now? Have we let them go, and found the Gospel better without them?

It is conceivable. Dr. Abbott writes about 'the kernel and the husk.' We do not give in to Dr. Abbott. Nobody gives in to Dr. Abbott now. He is a pariah to the unbeliever no less than to the believer. But have we not felt that after all the miracles did not matter? After all, have we not said to ourselves, the miracles *are* the husk? The kernel remains. The kernel is Redemption by the blood of Christ.

Redemption by the blood of Christ! 'No part of Christian phraseology has been in recent years more adversely criticised than that which is connected with the idea of redemption through blood.' So writes Professor Howard Masterman in the *Hibbert Journal* for July. In the pages of the *Hibbert Journal* itself he has sufficient evidence for his statement. If the husk has gone, the kernel has not been long in following it.

Shall we let Redemption by the blood of Christ follow? Professor Howard Masterman does not think we should. He does not deny that redemp-

tion by blood 'comes out of a cycle of thought which belongs to primitive stages of religious development.' But he does not think that it is the last condemnation of a doctrine to admit that it is old. On the contrary, the fact that it has lived so long seems to him to be in its favour. It is possible, he thinks, that its survival shows that in redemption by blood there is a truth of the religious life which cannot be expressed so well otherwise.

Mr. Howard Masterman is Professor of History in the University of Birmingham, and he feels the force of the modern objection to redemption by blood. He feels it to the full. He acknowledges that to him it is startling language. He had almost called it crude. He seems to think that it goes beyond the facts, for he says that if religious phraseology is to appeal to the wayfaring man it must 'surprise by a fine excess.' But of course it is a metaphoric. And he does not see why a metaphor which is common enough in other spheres should be denied entrance into the sphere of religion.

We say, 'He shed his blood for his country's salvation.' We say, 'The nation was saved by the blood of her noblest citizens.' We say, 'Blood is thicker than water.' We speak of 'blood relations' and of 'nobility of blood.' And when a

Salvation Army captain leads off at some street corner with—

There is a fountain filled with blood,
 Drawn from Immanuel's veins;
 And sinners, plunged beneath that flood,
 Lose all their guilty stains,—

we need not be astonished or disgusted as though we never heard or used such language. We should consider what it means.

Now, when we consider, we find that it means a personal experience on the part of that Salvation Army captain. A change has taken place in his life. He is no longer the man that he was. And he is persuaded that that change has come through a death that happened long ago, the influence of which is still at work in the world. *You* may say that he has ceased to disobey the ordinary laws of life, and is now seeking to understand and obey them. *He* says that he has been redeemed by the blood of Christ. You escape the anthropomorphism. He has the sense of personal relationship, and in that lies the secret of power.

And the very phrase which the Salvation Army captain uses has its appropriateness. It may have come to him out of the far past. There is no offence in that. It has simply come along the lines of an experience which has been similar to his all the world over. It has, says Professor Howard Masterman, an appropriateness that no other phrase would probably supply.

For, in the first place, it expresses *cost in moral movement*. 'It expresses the idea that the process of evolution is no easy and plain ascent up the scale of being, but that man's progress at every stage must be bought by sacrifice of personal comfort or inclination to larger issues.' At the very foundation of this religion there lies a story which commits the believer to the true rather than to the easy path. For he knows that the sacrifice of which he sings was a voluntary sacrifice. The secret of the appeal of the blood of Christ is in

these words, 'No man taketh my life from me: I lay it down of myself.'

In the second place, it suggests *the supreme value of life*. What does all this language about blood mean? It means that the thing of supreme value—the thing that a man finds worth giving—is himself. All other gifts are external, unsatisfying. The blood of Christ becomes a challenge. 'As I have loved you.' The martyr knows that blood poured out for him asks for nothing less in return.

And then, finally, the blood of Christ expresses *personal union with Christ*, as no other phrase can express it. That is what the unbeliever objects to. That is what he calls crude, primitive, savage. But it is true. It is as true to-day as ever it was. The blood of Christ was shed on Calvary, but the earth did not cover it there. It has life to-day. It enters into those who believe on Christ. It enters into their blood. We arouse the anger of some descendant of the Scandinavian sea-kings, and we say that we have aroused in him the blood of his Norse ancestors. Surely, says Professor Howard Masterman, when we come upon unexpected traits of goodness in a man who has been brought within the Christian influence, we are entitled to say that we have aroused in that man the blood of Christ. Surely we may permit him to say that by the blood of Christ he has been redeemed from iniquity.

And then Professor Howard Masterman plainly says that you and I and all of us would be less startled by the phraseology of the blood of Christ if we had a larger experience of the discipline of suffering and a deeper sense of sin.

The familiar example of those 'vain traditions' by which the Pharisees made the word of God of none effect is the plucking of the ears of corn on the Sabbath day. Another example has just come from Jerusalem.

There is much excitement at present in Jeru-

saalem. Its occasion is the death of Dr. Herzl, the leader of the Zionist movement. The liberal and progressive Jews are in favour of the Zionist movement, and they use peculiarly Jewish methods of advancing it. A young Ashkenaz Jew, says a correspondent of the *Guardian*, showed a friend a slip of paper which contained the Hebrew characters—

ה. ה. ש. ד. מ. ה.

He told this story. A century ago a great Rabbi in Vilna (Russia) died. When his will was read, directions were found that a letter which he had addressed to the Rabbis in Jerusalem should not be opened until one hundred years had elapsed. The hundred years have elapsed. The Jerusalem Rabbis received the letter and opened it. It contained nothing but those Hebrew characters. And what do those Hebrew characters mean? One after another tried to read them. At last the riddle was solved. A great Rabbi read the writing and gave the interpretation. It was—ה Jehovah; ש = shall raise up; ד = Dr.; מ = Theodore; ה = Herzl.

But there are conservative Jews who are opposed to the Zionist movement. They will not have Dr. Herzl to reign over them. For they think that by his imprudent declaration that the Sultan was in need of money, and would be glad to sell Palestine to the Jews for a few millions, he has shut them out of the country. The Sultan heard of it. There were laws in existence which prohibited Jews from entering; he at once enforced them. European Jews were compelled to lay a deposit on landing, as a pledge that they would not remain in the country more than thirty days. The time was afterwards extended to three months, and the Jews have little trouble in getting round the restriction altogether. Still it is trying to have to resort to bribery. And they do not cherish the memory of Dr. Herzl.

But the chief objection to the Zionist movement is religious. The local Talmudical colleges have discovered that the Zionist movement is a purely

secular one. They declare that Dr. Herzl was an agnostic. They say that the Abarbanel Library, where the memorial service was held after the news of Dr. Herzl's death reached Jerusalem, is dangerous to religion, for it is opened on the Sabbath. Young men who ought to be in the synagogues, or the Talmud Torah schools, studying Mishna and Gemara, are found in the Abarbanel Library reading the newspapers. Now there may be nothing in the Law or the traditions against the reading of newspapers on the Sabbath day, but the newspapers are often placed on the tables uncut, and the Sabbath is profaned by the manual labour of cutting them.

On July 15 was published the first number of a new quarterly journal called *The Celtic Review* (Edinburgh: Norman Macleod; 2s. 6d. net). Its acting editor is Miss E. C. Carmichael, with whom is associated as consulting editor the Professor of Celtic in the University of Edinburgh, Mr. Donald Mackinnon. The scope of *The Celtic Review* will be wider than religion, but it will embrace religion. Our purpose in noticing its first number is to direct attention to an article by Mr. Alfred Nutt on 'The Critical Study of Gaelic Literature.'

For many months some of the Church papers have had their correspondence columns crowded with letters on the Criticism of the Old and New Testaments. The *Guardian*, the *Record*, the *Rock*, the *Church Times*, the *Church Family Newspaper*, *Church Bells*,—all have been under the flood. And what does it signify? It signifies that even yet there are very many educated men who do not see that the Bible is literature and had sooner or later to submit to the process of criticism through which all the literature of the world has to pass. They resent the criticism of the Bible. They resent the very name of criticism. They seize on the adjective 'higher' and, without waiting to consider what it means, call it presumption. They look upon the whole movement as the unmistakable

evidence of the activity of Antichrist in our midst.

Now it is not to be denied that Antichrist is in it. But only in the way of spoiling it. The movement is a movement in the march of truth. And Antichrist is there to thwart it, to misrepresent it, to arouse prejudice both for and against it, to prevent it, if he can, from doing the work which God has sent it into the world to do. For, all the world over, criticism is now at work. And all the world over, except in the sphere of the Bible, its work is recognized as joyfully beneficial.

It has just entered the sphere of Celtic literature, and its worth has been at once recognized. For, in the first place, it has enabled the student of Celtic literature to see that the inheritance of the Gaelic race (with which Mr. Nutt has most immediately to do) is not only in chronicle, genealogy, architecture, and such well-recognized sources of history, but (to use Mr. Nutt's own words) 'that saga and saint's legend, ballad and romance, vision and satire, elegy and lyric eulogium of nature, are elements of first-rate importance for the realization of such a story of the Gaelic race as shall be of general and world-wide, and not merely racial and provincial, significance.' And, in the second place, it has given the student of Celtic literature the power to extract this truth out of these unlikely elements. For, in spite of the awful examples which the newspaper columns contain, criticism is as little liable to err in the hands of a well-trained critic as the surgeon's knife in the hands of a disciplined and merciful surgeon.

The most frequent objection in the newspapers to criticism is that it is a creature of Evolution. Everything nowadays has to have a beginning, a middle, and an ending. The critic criticises the first chapter of Genesis, it is said, because it is too wise for the youth of the world. If his Evolution did not compel him to find progress everywhere, he would let the story of the Creation stand as it

is. Why can he not see that God is able to bring men and matters into the world full-grown?

The critic answers that God may be able, but He does not do it. Evolution is not the plaster-cast into which the critic must crush his discoveries. It is itself a discovery. It is in the line of the mind's working. To our time and to our mind has been given this vision, that in God's wide universe no Athene springs armed from the head of Zeus, but all is orderly, progressive. When the Son of God came into the world, the event was great enough for the song of angels, but the shepherds were sent to find a babe.

The critic's very first business is to set literature in touch with time. 'Who wrote the Book of Genesis' is of less consequence than 'When was it written.' Moses, Hammurabi, Homer were the spokesmen of their day and generation. When the literature of a nation is set in touch with the nation's history, it at once, in Mr. Nutt's words, ascends from the merely racial and provincial into world-wide significance. For God's method of beginning with the babe is His universal method. 'The true history of Israel,' says Mr. Nutt, 'could not be written until the various stages of a literature, extending over centuries, but arbitrarily bound up within the covers of one volume, had been discriminated and arranged in chronological order; and before we can essay the true history of the Gaelic race, we must classify and date the literary monuments which it has bequeathed to us.'

It is, for us at least, only when literature is set in touch with time that it is seen to be in touch with eternity. We do not find God in the Bible until we have found man in it. 'Elijah,' says James, 'was a man of like passions such as we are, and he prayed.' Set the three in their place: Elijah—James—us. Great stretches of time lie between. But of like passions all three, all finding the need of prayer, all finding prayer a 'problem.' When we have found Elijah, a man, a man of his time among the men of his time, and when we have

found him praying, we go with new confidence to the throne of Grace, saying not 'Where is God?' but 'Where is the God of Elijah?'

In the *Reader Magazine* of America for the month of August there is found an article by Mr. Israel Zangwill on 'Roosevelt and Russian Scandal.' What have we to do with Roosevelt and Russian Scandal?

The story is this. In October 1903 Mr. Mosely took out to America a band of trained men of science, men specially trained in the science of education, to consider and see whether America's pre-eminence was due to her superior methods of education. On leaving New York, Mr. Mosely and his Commissioners travelled straight to Washington, and were received by the President at the White House. It was Wednesday the 28th day of October. They were all there, and President Roosevelt delivered an address. It was 'a most interesting address,' and in the midst of it there was 'a notable passage.' The Commissioners were all struck with that passage. They all reported it. But when the Report was published, it was found that not two of them had reported it in the same way.

Hear Mr. Zangwill. 'We will begin with Mr. Mosely: "One notable passage in President Roosevelt's speech was his reference to his belief that while education could not make a country, the nation that neglected to educate its people would be assuredly undone in the long run." Here is a proposition with an air of balanced wisdom, clouded perhaps by the indefiniteness attaching to the term "education," but still with the epigrammatic ring of a genuine gnome. But what is my astonishment to read in the report of Mr. John Whitburn, Member of the Education Committee of Newcastle-on-Tyne, "President Roosevelt said, when addressing the members of the Commission at the White House: Education may not save a nation, but a nation would certainly be ruined without it."'

What does Mr. Zangwill mean? He means that the Synoptic Gospels are not to be trusted. He means that when you find St. Matthew saying, 'If a man die, having no children'; and St. Mark, 'If a man's brother die, and leave a wife behind him, and leave no child'; and St. Luke, 'If a man's brother die, having a wife, and he be childless,' you conclude that they are not to be trusted as true historians. He means that the criticism of the Gospels has done away with their Christ.

Mr. Zangwill does not once mention the Gospels or the Christ of the Gospels. But there is no doubt of his meaning. He quotes other five versions of President Roosevelt's saying by other five men. They all differ a little, and he professes the utmost astonishment. Now, he says, these men are not peasants or fishermen; they are educational experts and specialists, picked out to report upon the very subject of the training of the mind to accurate perception and execution. If they cannot be trusted to give an accurate report of a great man's words, how much less the writers of the Gospels. That is his meaning.

But now, suppose that Mr. Mosely and Mr. Whitburn had *not* differed. Suppose that their report had been identical, word for word. Would Mr. Zangwill have been satisfied that he had obtained an accurate account of what President Roosevelt said? He would not. He would have simply said that the two reporters had agreed to say exactly the same thing, or that the editor of the Report had made them agree. He would probably have concluded that the Report was 'cooked' throughout.

Mr. Zangwill is not alone. This is one of the most common ways, and it is perhaps the most successful way, in which Christ is discounted in our day. You cannot believe in Him because you cannot find Him. The Christ of the Gospels is a contradiction, and there is no other. For Mr. Zangwill is not concerned with the Gospels, any more than we are. He is concerned with Christ. When

he hints that the Gospels are not to be trusted, he means that the Messiah has not come.

But it does not follow. Mr. Zangwill says that seven trained reporters of a saying of President Roosevelt do not agree upon that saying. He proves that they do not. Does he conclude that President Roosevelt never existed? Does he conclude that he is not President? Does he even conclude that he did not utter that saying? He does none of these things. He merely draws our attention to the familiar fact that different reports of a saying may be substantially true without being verbally accurate, and that their very difference tells us that we have more than one good witness to the saying.

‘For we must needs die, and are as water spilt upon the ground which cannot be gathered up again; neither doth God take away life, but deviseth means that he that is banished be not an outcast from him.’ So said the Wise Woman of Tekoa (2 S 14¹⁴). The translation is not certain, for the text is not pure. But the rendering of the Revised Version will do. The words are more than the Wise Woman of Tekoa knew.

At least we think so. We think they must be more. It was her idea of God. Only in Israel could a Wise Woman be found with such an idea of God. But we cannot believe that even in Israel could any one be found able to express all that her words carry with them. They carry with them the story of the Prodigal Son and the Cross on Calvary.

They express the Wise Woman’s idea of God and of man. Of man she says that when he is dead he is dead. We must all needs die, and when we die we are as water spilt on the ground which cannot be gathered up again. When we are dead we are dead, and that is the end of us. Better see to it that we do not die.

She began to move David. Joab had sent her.

No man ever knew his master better than Joab knew David. He did not always agree with his master. He sometimes thought the king foolish. He sometimes thought it his duty to save the king from himself. It was Joab himself that was the fool. Looking at them both from this far distance we are bound to say that the diplomatic Joab, one of the greatest statesmen and generals of all time, was more of a fool than David. And when he was most diplomatic he was most a fool. He was a diplomatic fool now. He should not have sent the Wise Woman to David. Still, he knew his master thoroughly. And he knew the words that in the mouth of the Wise Woman would move the king.

When we die we die, she said. Better not let us die. If Absalom dies, he is dead. Had not the king better see to it that Absalom does not die?

Did she know what she was saying? She did not know. She thought that the death of the body ended the life of the person. She thought there was nothing so calamitous, nothing so irretrievable, as the death of the body. She urged the king to send for Absalom in case he should die. If he dies he is as water spilt on the ground which cannot be gathered up again. Better bring him home before he dies. She did not know that Absalom was dead already.

For banishment is death. There is no other thing worth calling death. When Jesus reached the house of Jairus He found the mourners making a noise. ‘Give place,’ He said, ‘the maid is not dead’; and they laughed Him to scorn. But He knew that she was not dead. For He had come to give the dead life. But not Jairus’ daughter, not the widow’s son, not Lazarus. He had not come to recover this one and that one from the grave. He had come to seek and to save the lost. He had come to get the banished home again. And when, in His own story, the prodigal returned from the far country, He purposely made the

father say, 'This my son was dead, and is alive again.'

It is banishment that is death. It is separation. The death of the body does not separate. It often unites. 'To depart and to be with Christ' is often its proper definition. 'She that liveth in sin is dead while she liveth,' for she is banished from God. Absalom was dead already.

The Wise Woman did not know that Absalom was dead already. She did not know that banishment was death. But she knew the thing that follows that. She knew that God does not send anyone into banishment. This was her great discovery about God. This was the great discovery of the nation of Israel about God. As she put it, 'God doth not take away life.' We read, 'So God drove out the man.' But we know that the man drove himself out. We read Cain's bitter complaint, 'Behold, thou hast driven me out this day from the face of the earth, and from thy face shall I be hid,' but we know that Cain drove himself forth. In the New Testament it is put very plainly. 'And not many days after the younger son gathered all together and took his journey into a far country.' Nay, even in the Old Testament, David did not banish Absalom. It came to pass that Absalom fled. God does not send anyone into banishment.

Nor does God keep any one in banishment. All the while that His banished ones are away He is longing for their return. Again her thought is a great one, but it is almost an unconscious thought now. She is thinking of David rather than of God. But this thought of David is a true thought of God. In the Parable of the Prodigal Son the reader is taken to the far country to follow the fortunes of the prodigal. But all the while that the prodigal is spending his substance in the far country, what is the father doing at home? He is longing for the prodigal's return. The historian of Absalom's career is a little more communicative about the father than the historian of the prodigal. 'So Absalom fled,' he says, 'and

went to Geshur, and was there three years; *and the soul of king David longed to go forth unto Absalom.*'

Joab knew that. He sent the Wise Woman to the king because he knew that the soul of the king was longing after Absalom. Joab did not sympathize with the king. He counted the king's longing after Absalom folly and self-indulgence. And we? When the prodigal has come to himself, and can plainly be seen on his way back, we rejoice that the Father should run to meet him. That much we have learned from Jesus. The Pharisees did not know even that. But that the soul of the Father should be longing after the prodigal while he is away in the far country wasting his substance in riotous living, and that he would have done everything to bring him back, —we have not learned that yet.

We say that if God really longs to bring the prodigal back, He has nothing to do but fetch him. Surely He does according to His will in the army of heaven and among the inhabitants of the earth. Yes, He does. But He cannot fetch a prodigal home until the prodigal is ready to come.

David's heart longed after Absalom. David, you say, could have sent for Absalom to come back. He did send. And he sent too soon. Absalom was not ready to return. What a story it is from this point onward to the end. Absalom is brought back before he is ready to come. He is a petulant wilful child still. 'See, Joab's field is near mine, and he hath barley there: go and set it on fire.' Joab suffered for it that Absalom was brought back before he was ready to come. Absalom suffered for it also. But David suffered for it most of all.

God never makes the mistake which David made. He never brings us back before we are ready to come. His soul is consumed in longing for our return, but He must wait. The utmost that He can do is to devise means so that His banished may not be banished from Him for ever.

'He deviseth means.' This was the Wise Woman's greatest word. What did she understand by it? She understood that God devises means to bring men back before they are ready to come. She knew no better than that.

And David knew no better than that. Her words touched the king. He gave the order, 'Go therefore, bring the young man Absalom back.' He did not want to consider if Absalom was ready to return. He did not consider what means God devises to make His banished ready.

What means does God devise? What means should David himself have devised to make Absalom ready to come back? He should have left his throne and gone out to Absalom in his

banishment. We know no other means. God Himself seems to know no other.

Though he was rich, yet if David the king, for Absalom's sake, had become poor, going out to Geshur and sharing his banishment, he might have won the heart of Absalom. Then would the banishment of Absalom have come to an end. No doubt it would have been death to the king, for banishment is death—a desperate remedy. But the case was desperate, and we know no other remedy for it. 'Who, though He was rich'—rich in the fellowship of the Father, there is no other riches but that,—'yet for our sakes became poor,' crying, 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?' He was wounded for our transgressions. He was banished even unto death.

Peter 'the Venerable' of Cluny.

A SKETCH FROM MEDIÆVAL CHURCH HISTORY.

BY PROFESSOR G. GRÜTZMACHER, PH.D., HEIDELBERG.

THE title of 'the Venerable' is given to Peter of Cluny by Friedrich Barbarossa of Hohenstaufen. And unquestionably the abbot of Cluny is a pure and noble type of the monastic piety of the Middle Ages. The congregation at Cluny had already left behind it the culminating point of its greatness when Peter was put at the head of the widely ramifying spiritual community, but he succeeded in still bringing about a renaissance of the decaying order. The star of the Cistercians had already risen in full splendour in the heaven of religious orders, and to it belonged the immediate future, until it faded in its turn before the order founded by the most remarkable saint of the Middle Ages—St. Francis.

Peter, like all his predecessors in the office of abbot, was of very noble birth. The Cluny order of monks is still quite an aristocratic institution. The family to which Peter belonged, probably that of the lords of Montboissier, was settled in the Auvergnés. The year of his birth is not certain, but it was either 1092 or 1094. He grew up in a home of exemplary piety, four of his six brothers

choosing an ecclesiastical career, and only two clinging to secular pursuits. His mother, Raingarde, trained her children to strict reverence for the Church. When that fiery preacher of penance, Robert of Arbrissel, uttered his call to repentance, Raingarde, too, vowed that, after the death of her husband, she would become a nun. In the Cluny priory of Marçigny she carried out this resolution, and there she died in 1134. In a letter full of grateful filial love, Peter communicates to his brothers the death of the best of mothers: her body was devoted to work, her heart to penitence.

In the Cluny monastery of Souçilanges-Clermont Peter grew up, and as a Latin stylist developed a skill which put him almost on a level with Bernard of Clairvaux. His marked ability led the Abbot Hugo 1. to appoint him prior of Vezelay, and afterwards of Domne. Then came the dark days, when Abbot Pontius held sway at Cluny, and completely deranged the finances of the monastery by his boundless luxury and excessive display. When his dissolute administration became intolerable,

Pontius was constrained to resign. Compelled sorely against his will to take this step, he vowed a pilgrimage to the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem. Hugo II. was chosen to succeed him, but died after holding office for only three months. Hugo was succeeded, on 27th August 1122, by Peter, who was only thirty years of age, but who was recommended for the office, not only by his noble descent, but by the remarkable qualities of character he displayed, energy being coupled with mildness. Peter in the first place re-established order in Cluny, and made a sincere effort also to set the monastery once more on a sound financial basis. If he did not completely succeed in this last matter, the reason was that the Cluny system of management was an antiquated one, being based, like that of the great seignories of the earlier Middle Ages, upon a system of drawing interest and rents; whereas the Cistercians, accommodating themselves to the social transformation that had taken place, kept the management of their property in their own hands. The usages at Cluny, which had been long handed down by oral tradition, and were only codified for the first time under Abbot Hugo I., were subjected by Peter to a thorough revision. The criticism directed by Bernard of Clairvaux against the luxury of Cluny, led at least to the removal of the worst abuses. Everything was going well, when Pontius suddenly returned to Cluny, and made himself master of the monastery while Peter was absent on a visitation journey in Spain. Pontius commenced a reign of terror, and introduced in the monastery a shameless household system of mistresses. Then Pope Honorius II. interposed, and summoned Pontius and Peter to Rome. Pontius was declared to have forfeited the office of abbot, and died of fever at Rome in 1126. Although he had died unreconciled with the Church, to the credit of the monastery he was buried at Cluny with full honours. Peter, too, had been attacked by fever, but, by the blessing of God, and thanks to the medical treatment of skilled clerical hands, returned to Cluny cured. Here he had to reply to Bernard of Clairvaux, who had once more reproached the Cluny establishment with its deviations from the rule of St. Benedict. Bernard, unquestionably more original than Peter, and his intellectual superior, but also the more passionate and unfair of the two, received an extraordinarily adroit answer. Peter defended the milder usage of Cluny, and the right to change

the rule of St. Benedict if this was done only out of love. With a firmness free from any approach to rudeness, with a suavity which avoids going into details, with a matchless breadth of view, he combated the pedantic interpretation of the rule, and with skilful casuistry cloaked the real deviations from it as brought about by considerations of fitness. Christ, he declares, knows His sheep, not by their fleece, but by their love and faith; so that it is a matter of indifference whether one wears a black or a white cowl. Peter succeeded in smoothing the asperities between the people of Cluny and the Cistercians, and a bond of sincere friendship grew up between him and the great Cistercian abbot. Acting hand in hand with Bernard, he was able to compose the schism that threatened the Church. In the year 1130 Innocent II. was selected as pope by the minority of cardinals, Anaclete II. (sprung from a family of wealthy Jewish money-lenders) by the majority. Although Anaclete was an ex-monk of Cluny, Peter took the side of Innocent, and banned the representative of his own order. Thanks to the support of the two powerful abbots, Peter and Bernard, Innocent speedily obtained recognition by the French king Louis VI., the English king Henry I., and the German king Lothair.

Like Bernard, Peter, too, combated the enemies of the Church. As he did not possess the gift of overpowering eloquence as a popular preacher, he felt the proper course to be to fight with literary weapons. Thus he set himself to controvert the Petrobusians, who, along with a disposition to give to Christianity an inward direction, rejected infant baptism and the 'abomination' of the mass, burned crosses, and pulled down churches because God could be invoked equally well in the stable or the taproom as at the altar. He argued against them from the Bible only, as they rejected the authority of the Church Fathers and of tradition. The transformation of bread and wine into the flesh and blood of Jesus Christ in the Lord's Supper he tried to make intelligible by biblical analogies like the miracle at Cana, or natural processes like the conversion of water into ice.

Far sharper than his conflict with the Petrobusians was Peter's opposition to the Jews. The latter appear to him worse than the Saracens, who reject only the divinity and the resurrection of Jesus Christ, whereas the Jews do not believe in Christ at all. He laments that the Jews may not

be exterminated with the sword, seeing that, according to the promise, they are to be converted in the last days. He makes the draconic demand that, while the lives of the Jews are to be spared, their usurious money be taken from them. He declares that they earn nothing by ordinary agricultural labour or regular military service or by any honourable and useful calling, but fill their chests with gold by purchasing from thieves the articles of value they have stolen from the churches. Peter takes great pains to prove to the Jews from the Scriptures, allegorically interpreted, that the Messiah is the Son of God, nay, that He is God, and no earthly king; and that He came in the person of Jesus, and is not to be looked for in the future.

A fresh discord threatened to arise between Peter and Bernard, when Abelard knocked at the monastery gate of Cluny. This illustrious victim of freedom of thought in life and science came there a broken-down man. Abelard's works had two sides, and Peter had always seen only that one that was turned towards the Church. As his mind was not a systematic one, the heretical consequences of Abelard's teaching escaped his notice, and, since he was conscious of a fellowship with God, exalted above the subtleties of dogmatic wranglings, he readily effected a reconciliation between Abelard and the heresy-hunting Bernard. In a warm and courageous letter to Pope Innocent II., he begged permission to admit Abelard to Cluny. Here, at the end of a walk at the foot of the monastery walls, looking out on great wood-girt meadows, beside a murmuring brook, Abelard would sit meditating under a massive lime tree, his eyes turned towards the convent Paraclete, where Heloise resided. By the advice of physicians he was sent to the monastery of St. Marcellus at Chalons, and there, in 1142, the restless soul found peace. The news of his death was conveyed to Heloise by Peter in a letter which breathes the deepest sympathy for the lady who was at one time bound to Abelard by the closest fleshly ties, and afterwards by the better and stronger tie of divine love. Abelard was buried at Paraclete, the funeral office being discharged by Peter himself, who by his absolution and blessing removed the last stain from the dead. At the request of Heloise, Peter further sent to her a formal decree of absolution, which she attached to the coffin of the man she had loved.

In 1141 Peter had undertaken a journey to

Spain to arrange for the Koran being translated into Latin by Peter of Toledo and the Englishman, Robert of Rethen, who was settled at Pampeluna as archdeacon. This work, containing extracts from the Koran, was sent by Peter to Bernard of Clairvaux, with the request that he would write a refutation of it. As Bernard failed to do so, he himself composed five books (of which the last three are lost) against the 'abominable sect of the Saracens.' Peter makes no false imputations against Mohammed, and accords due recognition to his proclamation of the one God. But he attributes the subsequent rise of Mohammedanism as a world-religion to a lust for rule. Peter is severe in his strictures on Mohammed's careful injunction not to discuss his teaching—an injunction which, he declares, robs man of reason and reduces him to the level of the beasts. A religion, he adds, which cannot be diffused by arguments, but only by the sword, cannot possibly be the true one. Quite unintelligible to Peter was the eclectic procedure of the prophet in the matter of Holy Scripture, for he sees nothing but a subterfuge in Mohammed's assertion that the Bible has been tampered with. He tries the life of Mohammed by the scholastic categories, and concludes accordingly that one who wrought no miracles and had not the gift of prediction can have been only a false prophet.

Peter maintained the closest relations with the popes. Eight times he crossed the Alps to pay his respects to Innocent II., Coelestin II., Lucius II., and Eugene III. Suddenly there sprang up in the breast of the ageing abbot the wish of his youth that he might end his days in concealment as a recluse. But Bernard dissuaded Eugene III. from granting the necessary permission, on the ground that the Church could not dispense with such a personality.

The last literary work of Peter consisted of two books on the miracles of which he had had personal experience or of which he had received credible information. It is an extremely interesting work from the point of view of the history of culture, because it witnesses to the enormous hold that imagination had upon the childlike minds of himself and his contemporaries. The miracles in question are connected especially with the sacrament of the altar and of confession, with the appearances of angels and dead persons in dreams, and with visions. In these appearances of the

dead there is often at work a tender conscience, speaking of past unkindness. The appearances have frequently a pedagogic and what might be called a police aspect, and bear the features of supra-earthly justice.

Peter was plunged into deep sorrow by the unfortunate issue of the Crusade of 1147, which had been instigated by Bernard, and on which Peter had placed high hopes. He was doomed to see also the back-stroke of the Crusade, which showed itself in the uprising of the lawless elements in France. In 1153 Peter received a heavy blow in the death of his friend Bernard. An old friend made his appearance at Cluny in 1155 in the person of Bishop Henry of Winchester, the twin-brother of King Stephen of England. He had fled to Cluny for refuge from King Henry II. of England. He brought with him princely gifts, which enabled Peter to liquidate the debts of the monastery. A longing for death now seized upon the abbot, who had grown to feel lonely. In 1157 he wrote to the Carthusian friars that he should like to be called away on Christmas Day. On Christmas Eve he preached once more, and in the early dawn of the festival commemorating the birth of the Infant Saviour, with his eyes fixed upon a wooden crucifix, he passed away.

Peter's was a lofty, pure, and devout personality. His religion, like that of his great contemporary, Bernard of Clairvaux, was wholly Christocentric. It was one result of the Crusades, that the bare abstract conception of God was reanimated by the features of Jesus Christ. 'Thou shouldst not glory either in loquacious logic or curious physics, or in anything save Jesus Christ and Him crucified.' Theologically, the ecclesiastical supernaturalism of Peter is closely connected with the Biblical. Augustine, the man of the *Confessions*, with his passionate love to Christ, comes nearest to his heart. To the unphilosophical abbot of Cluny even philosophy is no speculative science, but a practical and ethical struggle for redemption from sin and from passions. Happy in his limitations, he remained a stranger to the insatiable demand

for new objects of knowledge and study. His conception of the monastic life is free and lofty. 'Mere outward separation from the world will do thee no good, if thou hast not the only strong wall against the evil that rises up within thee—that wall which is the Saviour. Living in fellowship with Him, imitating Him in His sufferings, thou shalt be safe against all thy foes. Without this protection, it profits thee nothing to retire into seclusion; nay, a man only thereby exposes himself to stronger temptations, those of pride and vanity.' Again and again he impresses it upon his monks that, 'without Christ, the narrow cell, the bloody scourging, the painful pilgrimage avail nothing. The one thing that is pleasing to God is a pious heart.' The witness of a good conscience is to Peter the only sure consolation of the godly in all trouble. Fastings, vigils, good works, he would value only as disciplinary means, which profit nothing without love. 'Men plant nurseries, till the fields, irrigate meadows, carve boxes, combs, cups; or, instead of the plough, they grasp the pen and, in place of the fields, labour on the pages of Holy Scripture, sowing upon parchment the seed of the divine word, which satisfies the hungry reader.'

Peter's monastic life did not destroy his appreciation of nature. This shows itself in his holy delight in the verdure of spring, and in mountain tops and forest loneliness. Nor did it quench such dutiful feelings as love to his mother and his brothers, which reveals itself as specially hearty and deep. And, above all, the seclusion of the cloister proved to Peter the best nursery for the purest and tenderest friendship. His letters to his friends are full of testimonies to noble friendship as between man and man. A mild, conciliatory personality, of lofty genius and nobility of soul, the friend of Bernard and Abelard, he rounded the sharp points in doctrine and in life, exalting the essentials of Christianity above the disputes of the schools, and placing the spirit of brotherly love above the legalism of the Church order to which he belonged.

Atonement in Christ.¹

BY THE REV. W. T. A. BARBER, M.A., D.D., HEADMASTER OF THE LEYS SCHOOL, CAMBRIDGE.

1. GOD is the Father of mankind. He has called into life a race of beings akin to Himself, yet with distinctness of individuality. Mankind is always conditioned by this essential relationship. Inasmuch as God's thoughts preceded man's being, and as God is the cause of his being, existence for man is meaningless, and belies its origin unless there be an ideal of his own nature to be reached, an ideal which exists in the mind of the originator. God's authority is permanent; His Fatherhood involves dominion. It is the essential Love in God which expresses itself in Fatherhood, but kingship and rule are necessary elements of perfect Fatherhood. Many of the current difficulties concerning the Atonement are due to the emasculation of the idea of Fatherhood, which is the reaction from its induration in earlier centuries of thought. The attainment, then, by man of the ideal of human nature is the permanent kingly will of the Father.

2. The New Testament reveals the second person of the Godhead, spoken of as Christ, as the organic head of the race. This is no mere word-juggling. He is 'the firstborn of all creation, for in Him (*ἐν αὐτῷ*) were all things created . . . through Him and unto Him (*δι' αὐτοῦ, εἰς αὐτόν*) [Col. 1¹⁶].' He speaks of Himself as the Son of man, and He regards Himself as the representative of the race. All creation had its aim, its goal directed *unto Him*. The underlying thought of the whole New Testament is of a vital permanent organic connexion between the Son of God and mankind. Creation is incomplete until consummated in Him. When in the fulness of the time He is born of a woman there is for the first time the full realization of the divine sonship in man; for the first time in an individual, Himself the organic head of the race, the ideal relation of man to God, of son to Father, is reached. In any scheme of a perfect humanity He is essential.

3. However it came about, we see that *sin exists*. Sins imply an underlying sinful disposition, just as the fall of apples from a tree is a momentary expression of the deep underlying law of gravitation. The fact of this sinful disposition is an outrage of God's standard for man. And this outrage is certainly voluntarily and deliberately committed. In our heart of hearts we know that we are responsible for sin, and God knows it. He resents this outrage of the very purpose of man's existence, this destruction of His thought for man, of the ideal set before man. The very intensity of His love measures the intensity of His wrath. He loves and is angry at the same time. The Monarch who is Father of His own subjects cannot, by the laws of His being, lay aside either love or anger while His children-subjects voluntarily and deliberately insult His standard and frustrate His plan. For this standard and plan are expressions of absolute righteousness.

4. Nor has this anger any element of selfishness. A righteous Fatherhood is bound to claim righteousness in its children. It is vital to the order of the universe. Sin, the infringement and destruction of that order, necessitates a penalty. If disobedience involved no penal consequence, the world would sink into moral chaos. The punishment of sin, both consequence and penalty, is death. Death is a much larger term than the mere sundering of soul from body. It is true that part of the penalty is the horror of physical death, for the sting of death is sin. But the death which is the penalty of sin is the cutting off from God. Just as the body lives by air and food and, when cut off from these, is said to die, so the man who is spirit, whose atmosphere is God, whose food is God's word, when he sins, cuts himself off from God; that is, he dies. The ideal aim is shattered, the goal is hopelessly missed; man was meant for life, he has instead fallen into death.

5. It is this wreck which has somehow to be remedied. Somehow or other alienated mankind must be brought back to God, must be restored to the air and food of the soul, must be rescued

¹ This was one of a series of twenty-minute addresses to the Cambridge Intercollegiate Christian Union. Thus it is the barest outline of a practical man's working-theory of the Atonement, given to a sympathetic but theologically untrained band of students.

from death and restored to life. Mere punishment is naught. Let us consider the feeble and broken analogy of a human father with an erring child who has broken the parental law. Love, patient but firm, breathes in every word of the father's unfolding of the sin; punishment must be inflicted, but the aim of every right-minded parent will be to win the love, the assent of the child, and its willing submission. Only thus is the right relation restored. So must it be with the divine treatment of sin and the sinful race. The penalty must be paid, and the race must return to love, to willing submission.

6. Hence the necessity of the Incarnation of the Divine Son. We have already seen that He is in organic relation to mankind; none other than He can be its true representative and head. If the return to God is to come at all, He must head it. Moreover, His Divinity brings to the work of rescue that perfection of power which mankind otherwise hopelessly lacked. There is no unreality in the whole. The Temptation was real, the Agony was woe untold. And all through He offered an obedience perfect, willing, and deliberate. This is an essential, vital principle of the Atonement; that the Great Head of mankind should as its representative come with joy to do God's will. But this obedience was an obedience unto death. The Atonement involved not only the Incarnation but the Cross. The perfect obedience of the Man, we have seen, balances the sin of man; and the willing surrender of life under penal conditions annuls sin. Death is the penalty of sin; He died as the direct consequence of sin, willingly drinking the Cup. Even to Him there came in some mysterious way the utter loneliness in death which showed how sin separates from God. And through it all

there was the perfect filial response as He gave His spirit into His Father's keeping. He was Son to the end.

The Atonement restored the race, as race, to its right position Godward. Man had given a perfect and willing obedience, had drunk to the dregs the bitter cup of death, the consequence of sin. That death could not hold Him was the result of the Godhead which thus set manhood in its ideal place.

7. It remains to point out in two or three words what we must avoid in any statement of the Atonement.

First, we must claim that it be remembered that to-day we are stating only one-half of our truth. Conversion in man remains to be considered.

Men object to the Atonement because they think it a suggestion of a bargain, a compounding for the remission of a penalty. The very phrase 'imputed righteousness' is often blamed as implying legal trickery. Many statements have been fairly open to this blame.

Above all must we avoid that travesty which pictures an angry God, the Father, importuned by a kindly God, the Son, into a reluctant forgiveness. Many a sentimental hymn sings this libel on God.

It is not the place here to enlarge on the mysterious and comforting truth of the Trinity. But the deeper we explore into its luminous depths the more do we feel how God is All and in All. God the Father and the Son it is who in all the Atonement wrought out Salvation, God the Father who is angry with the sin and the wicked because He is Father, God who so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son that whosoever believes in Him should not perish but have everlasting life.

Recent Foreign Theology.

A Short History of the Church.¹

It is no mean achievement to succeed in giving a clear, vivid picture of the entire course of the

¹ *Grundzüge der Kirchengeschichte*. Ein Ueberblick von Hans von Schubert, D.D., Prof. der Theologie, Kiel. Leipzig: J. C. B. Mohr; London: Williams & Norgate, 1904. 4s. net.

history of the Church in 300 pages. To do this requires not only easy command of all the facts, but also gifts of artistic, pictorial exposition. Dr. von Schubert possesses these qualifications in a remarkable degree. His pages are full without being crowded. With unflinching skill he selects characteristic names and movements, and makes them stand out as pictures from the canvas. He

is almost too good a master of racy, nervous German. A tolerable proficient in the language will often be brought up before a striking phrase or idiom. The titles of the sixteen chapters signalize the chief events of the entire period from the New Testament to the present day—Primitive Christianity, the Catholic Church, Christianity and the Roman Empire, the Papacy of the Middle Ages, the Reformation, and the Modern Churches. The author's own titles are much more picturesque than these.

It would not be easy to find a better description of the state of the world morally and religiously, at the time of Christ's appearance, than is given in the first chapter—'The Presuppositions.' The author does not fall into the error of exaggerating the darker shades; he rather leans to the other side, calling attention to the better elements in the philosophies and religions of the old world. The effects of contact between Judaism and Greek thought are clearly described. Uhlhorn, in his eloquent volumes, *The History of Christian Charity*, speaks of the old world as 'a world without love.' If there is here a touch of exaggeration, it is not altogether without justification. The best ideals of humanity and morals were indefinite and feeble. We are reminded of the saying of Epictetus, 'If thou wouldst be good, believe first that thou art bad,' and of Plutarch's declaration that the atheist is the most unhappy of men. 'In antiquity, religion and the state are not to be separated from each other. To worship the gods is to guard the sacred hearth of the state, to fulfil its civic duties. Polytheism is inseparably bound up with this political and national character of the religion: so many states, so many deities.'

The work strikingly illustrates the law of development in doctrine and polity. No break occurs until the Reformation. The author criticises the theory, current among some Protestant writers, of a first age of ideal purity followed by periods of apostasy. At the very beginning, a Christian Church arises, 'and this Church arises as Catholic, or, otherwise stated, the first form in which the Christian Churches were organized is the Catholic Church.' This is declared to be not a declension or falling away. 'This was just the form in which Christianity gained footing in the world by God's will, no artificial creation, but a natural growth out of the circumstances of the time.' There is a great amount of truth in this

view. It is difficult, if not impossible, to draw a line between one age and another. The germs of every new phase are found in the earlier age. But it does not follow that every development is right. The author himself shows the contrary to be the case. Three of his most graphic chapters (5, 6, 7) are devoted to showing that Christian doctrine and worship degenerated into intellectualism, moralism or legalism, and ceremonialism. He quite adopts the modern view of the Harnack school, that the moral and religious spirit of New Testament Christianity was supplanted by elements taken from Greek philosophy and religion. The development theory is rigidly applied. We are almost left with the impression that the course which things took was inevitable. Another chapter, dealing ably with the rise of the papal system, begins thus: 'The great problem of the rise of the papacy leads us back again to the rise of the Catholic Church in general. The two ideas, Roman and Catholic, are connected in their roots. Even in the rise of Catholicism Rome has the most considerable share.' In another place we are reminded that the origin of the Apostles' Creed, the New Testament canon, and the Episcopal system has to do with the imperial city.

The five chapters on the Middle Ages are singularly successful. 'Dark' becomes a misnomer. The author well points out that the gulf between the ancient world and these ages is far wider than that between the Middle Ages and modern days. In the latter case there is no breach of continuity. In the former case it is a new world that confronts us. As we might expect, Dr. von Schubert is very happy in emphasizing the new blood which the German races brought into European life. The story of the conflict between crown and mitre, emperor and pope, is vividly told. 'Empire and Priesthood, from Charles the Great to Innocent III,' shows us the papal power at its best and worst. 'Christian mediævalism is a continuation of Christian antiquity.' 'Is not the papacy, and an infallible and absolute papacy, the most logical and therefore most complete form of Catholicism, of Christianity organized in military, political fashion?' Nicholas I. (858-867) is described as 'a Hildebrand before Gregory VII.' 'He proclaims the absolute right of the papacy in the Church; its word is God's word, its act God's act, it rises to the idea of a spiritual

omnipresence of the apostolic chair. Judged by none, it judges all.' 'In Nicholas the universal State-church of Charles the Great turns into the universal Church-state: all Christendom a Church-state, the Pope the Kaiser, Princes like Bishops his vassals.' His theory was translated into fact by Gregory and Innocent. Scholastics and scholasticism are well sketched in a chapter on 'Religious Life in the Church of the Middle Ages.' The intellectualism, ascetism, and ceremonialism of earlier days now reached their zenith.

The four last chapters describe the dissolution of the mediæval system, the Reformation, and modern Church-history. The complexity of the modern world is almost too much for the author's skill in compression. The final pages are limited to German schools and conflicts.

J. S. BANKS.

Leeds.

Selected Psalms.¹

THE author, an Orientalist of the first rank and the writer of several able works in the Old Testament field, here selects forty Psalms, along with Hannah's Song and Jonah's Prayer, for exposition with all the resources of modern learning. The standpoint is the critical one. No Messianic reference is admitted. The Psalms are brought down to a late date. David and Moses are ruled out. The old Jewish headings are set aside as worthless. The tests by which questions of authorship and date are decided are internal tests of style and idea, and so peculiarly subjective and open to question. Hannah and Jonah have nothing to do with the Song and Prayer bearing their names. If the standpoint is accepted, the workmanship is of the highest quality. The blending of learning and devoutness is admirable. The author is master of a style of rare strength and plasticity. The translations are full of music and rhythm. The exposition essays to give the natural meaning of the Psalms as they would strike a contemporary. They are certainly made the utterances of a deeply meditative and reverent piety. The author does not follow the critical school on every point. He differs from it often

¹ *Ausgewählte Psalmen.* Übersetzt und erklärt von Hermann Gunkel, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck u. Ruprecht, 1904. Geb. 4s.

as regards the personality of the speaker in the Psalms, holding that the 'I' represents the individual, not the congregation or church. 'Some of the favourite, even fashionable, opinions of the day, as, e.g., the explanation of the "I" of the Psalms as the congregation, I have scarcely mentioned, because I think it utterly mistaken.' A striking feature in the exposition is the number of parallels drawn from other Oriental religions—a favourite source of illustrations with the author. The notes supply a carefully selected mass of explanatory references.

J. S. BANKS.

Leeds.

Miscellaneous.

Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique.—The thirteenth part of Vacant and Mangenot's great Catholic Dictionary contains 144 very large double-columned pages, and carries the alphabet from BOSNIE-HERZEGOVINE to CAJÉTAN. Its first striking article is on BOSSUET, for whom Professor Sargent of the Institut Catholique de Paris has been allowed 40 columns. Next comes BULGARIE in 61 columns and fifteen chapters, many of the chapters having their own special bibliography. It is written by Fr. Vailhé of Constantinople. The article on CABALE is as long as the article on CABALA in the *Jewish Encyclopedia*, and it includes the latter in its bibliography. Altogether it is a marvellously thorough work (Letouzey et Ané; 5 fr. net).

Dictionnaire d'Archéologie Chretienne et de Liturgie.—The immense article on ALEXANDRIA ends with this part (the fifth of the first volume). Its last chapter is on the election of the patriarch. The writer, F. Gabrol, is acquainted not only with Lightfoot's work, but even with the numbers of the *Journal of Theological Studies*. There is a very full and admirably illustrated article by Leclercq on AMBON. Then follows things Ambrosian at great length, the *Basilica* being again admirably illustrated. A curious half-pagan article on ÂME is still more richly illustrated, and of extraordinary antiquarian interest. It is unfinished in this part (Letouzey et Ané; 5 fr. net).

Jésus Messie et Fils de Dieu.—Professor Lepin of Lyons is the author of a new Life of

Christ, written wholly from the Synoptics. The Synoptic point of view is first stated, the writer having gathered it for himself from a careful protracted study of the Gospels he loves best; and then the Life in its stages is described according to that point of view (Letouzey et Ané; 3 fr. 50 c.).

Denifle's 'Luther.'—Some account was given in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES of the new 'scientific and absolutely unprejudiced' estimate of Luther by Father Denifle, in which he is charged with breaking all the commandments and, like Alexander, weeping because there were no more to break. Dr. W. Köhler of Giessen has written *Ein Wort* on Denifle. It might have been more humorous, but it is unanswerable (Williams & Norgate; 1s. 3d. net).

Die Sittenlehre Jesu.—There is no end to the interest of Jesus. This ethical age finds Him the most interesting phenomenon in ethics. Professor Ph. Bachmann of Erlangen has described the ethical value of Jesus for the present time (Deichert; M. 1.20).

A second edition has been published (Deichert) of Zahn's **Grundriss der Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanons**.

L'Evangile selon Saint Jean.—M. Lecoiffe of Paris is the publisher of a series of volumes which range under the general title of 'Biblical Studies' (*Études Bibliques*). The latest addition to the series is a commentary on *St. John's Gospel* by Père Calmes in one large volume. It is a work of excellent scholarship and liberal yet loyal faith. The author is particularly careful and successful in handling matters textual and grammatical. His knowledge of literature, including the most recent English work, proves him a great reader; but his extensive reading has evidently left him time to make up his own mind. Occasionally, in a brief discussion, such as that on the chronology of the Passion, the essential points of an intricate problem are set forth with great clearness; and a certain judicial detachment gives the writer's own conclusions weight.

A Thesaurus of Orthodoxy.—Orthodox—

Heterodox? Who is orthodox and who is not? We cannot tell until we know what orthodoxy is. Dr. Michalcescu of the University of Bucharest tells us what the orthodoxy of the Greek Church is by gathering together all the great Confessions and Creeds, public and private, not forgetting even certain famous prayers. He publishes the whole in the original Greek, being very careful with the text; and Professor Albert Hauck introduces the volume to German readers (Hinrichs; M. 5).

The Code of Hammurabi.—This is Winckler's edition. The literature of the Code is getting unwieldy, but Winckler must be secured at all costs (Hinrichs; M. 5.60).

Septuagint Studies.—Professor Alfred Rahlfs of Göttingen has published the first part of a series of studies on the Septuagint. His intention seems to be to go over the Greek translation of the Old Testament, book by book, but not verse by verse, only in the way of what is called introduction. He begins with the Books of Kings (Glasgow: Bauermeister; 3s.).

The Apocalypse.—Professor Joh. Weiss of Marburg, following in the wake of Gunkel, has written a commentary on the Apocalypse, which he properly describes as a contribution to the history of Literature and Religion. This is not the final form of commentary, but it is a necessary step in that direction; and it is very much more profitable reading and more edifying than the conventional word-for-word exposition (Glasgow: Bauermeister; 4s. 10d.).

Die Geschichte Jesu.—The second volume has been published of Dr. P. W. Schmidt's *History of Jesus*. The first volume gave the history itself, the second gives its interpretation. The interpretation is given under such headings as 'Paul,' 'John,' 'Agrapha,' 'Kingdom of God,' 'Messiah,' 'Law.' This occupies the first half of the volume. The second half is filled with notes on the first volume. In the end there is a terribly realistic picture of the Crucifixion (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr; London: Williams & Norgate; 7s. net).

St. Paul's Infirmary.

BY THE REV. WM. MENZIES ALEXANDER, M.A., B.Sc., B.D., C.M., M.D., GLASGOW,
PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY OF THE FREE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.

II.

THUS far only negations have been reached, and positive results are now to be sought. A fresh study of the records throws a new light upon the nature of the apostle's 'infirmary.' He had several attacks of illness, the features of which, with places and dates, are of prime importance.

The First Illness.—'I know a man in Christ, fourteen years ago, such a one caught up even to the third heaven. On behalf of such a one will I glory: but on mine own behalf I will not glory, save in mine infirmities. And by reason of the exceeding greatness of the revelations, that I should not be exalted overmuch, there was given to me a thorn for the flesh, a messenger of Satan to buffet me, that I should not be exalted overmuch. Concerning this thing, I besought the Lord thrice, that it might depart from me' (2 Co 12^{2, 5, 7, 8}).

The acute stage of Paul's illness was marked by excessive pain, and followed by extreme depression. His recovery was incomplete. He prayed for the removal of the dregs of his disease, yet these continued in chronic form. This attack occurred in the province of Cilicia, where the apostle was resident for some seven or eight years. His stay there terminated about the year 43 or 44 A.D. A little before his departure from this region, he had his first attack of illness: for it occurred fourteen years previous to the writing of the Second Epistle to the Corinthians. That letter is dated about the year 56 or 57 A.D. It brings us back, therefore, to the year 42 or 43 A.D., which is just about a year prior to the departure from Cilicia. During his stay in the province, Paul had his headquarters in Tarsus. Thither he had been sent from Jerusalem by the brethren; and thither Barnabas had come to seek him. The first illness of the apostle thus belongs to his native city of Tarsus: not less than the preceding visions and revelations. He went thence with Barnabas to Antioch in Syria. There he spent nearly four years, interrupted only by a visit to Jerusalem. That allowed ample time for rest, before setting

out on the first missionary journey. Paul was then so far restored that he was able to evangelize Cyprus in brilliant style, though all traces of his previous sickness may not have vanished at that date.

The Second Illness.—'Paul and his company set sail from Paphos and came to Perga in Pamphylia; and John departed from them and returned to Jerusalem. But they went across from Perga and arrived at Pisidian Antioch' (Ac 13^{13, 14}).

Leaving Cyprus, the party proceeded to the mainland; reaching Perga, the capital of the province of Pamphylia. That district was naturally the next sphere of labour. Luke certainly intends to suggest that Paul and Barnabas thus regarded it. But the stay in Perga was brief, and marked by disruption. Pamphylia was meanwhile passed over. Mark went on to Jerusalem, while the 'apostles' proceeded to Pisidian Antioch. Ramsay finds the reason of these movements in the illness of Paul, which required his departure from Perga to the higher ground of the interior. *But did Paul fall sick in Perga?* Ramsay admits the gravity of the case, but fails to observe how that would be a bar to an invalid undergoing the long and fatiguing journey to Pisidian Antioch, amid 'perils of rivers and perils of robbers.' Weizsäcker, on the other hand, believes that the illness occurred not in Perga, but in Pisidian Antioch. McGiffert holds that otherwise Paul would have gone home or back to Cyprus; while Mark would not have been said to have refused to go to 'the work,' had the journey to Antioch been for the sake of Paul's health. But the first argument here has no great cogency; for this attack was evidently acute, and the apostle's removal from Perga might have been impossible. The second argument, however, is valid, and must be allowed due weight. The whole evidence thus shows that the illness did not occur in Pamphylia, but in Southern Galatia. But why was nothing attempted in Perga? No hostility on the part of the people or of the Government is even hinted at; and none

of the party was as yet laid aside with sickness. Yet all with one consent hasten to clear out of the town. It thus becomes manifest that, for some reason or other, work in this district was at present impracticable, and removal from it a necessity. The whole circumstances suggest the prevalence of an epidemic in this region. Paul may have carried from Perga the germs of the disease which was afterwards fully developed in Pisidian Antioch. Eight days of hard travelling were sufficient for traversing the intervening distance of a hundred miles. Paul seems to have been an excellent walker, judging by his journey from Troas to Assos, covering some twenty miles in an afternoon (Ac 20¹³). Probably the close of the journey inland was coincident with the ending of the period of incubation of the disease, for the Galatians witnessed an acute attack of illness. If they saw an eruption or dreaded contagion, their contempt and loathing are easily intelligible. The scene of this fresh attack is therefore Pisidian Antioch; and according to Ramsay the date is either July or August in the year 47 A.D. Paul ultimately made such a good recovery that even the stoning at Lystra had little effect on him; but that does not prove the absence of all residual evil consequences.

The Third Illness.—‘We would not, brethren, have you ignorant concerning our affliction which befell us in (the province of) Asia, that we were weighed down exceedingly, beyond our power, inasmuch that we despaired even of life. Yea, we ourselves had the sentence of death within ourselves’ (2 Co 1⁸. 9).

On his first visit to Corinth, Paul arrived ‘in weakness and in fear and in much trembling’ (1 Co 2³). Writing to the Thessalonians shortly afterwards, he mentions his ‘distress and affliction’ (1 Th 3⁷). Hence the inference that he was again suffering from his ‘infirmity.’ Lightfoot would trace it in the note that Satan had hindered the apostle’s return to his converts (1 Th 2¹⁸). That, however, is a mistake; for the Rabbis drew a distinction between Satan as the author of all evil, and his subordinates as angels of punishment. Paul may, indeed, have come to Corinth disheartened by persecution in the northern cities and his meagre success in Athens. But his ‘weakness and fear and much trembling’ have no discoverable physical basis. There is no trace of illness, such as that at Tarsus or Pisidian Antioch.

He was well enough to work at his own trade and to preach every Sabbath. On the arrival of Silas and Timothy, there was such an outburst of energy that he surprised the blasphemous Jews and astonished the godless Greeks. So there could have been no fresh recurrence of the former illness on this first visit to Corinth. That overtook Paul afterwards in the Roman province of Asia, in the interval between the writing of the First and the Second Epistle to the Corinthians. During this period the apostle was resident in two cities only. These were Ephesus and Troas. But in the former he enjoyed such an excellent measure of health that he was there ‘at all seasons,’ for the space of three years, warning every man, night and day with tears. At the same time he maintained himself and his companions by the labour of his own hands. Though, speaking after the manner of men, he had fought with beasts at Ephesus, he had no intention of leaving the place before his own time at Pentecost. The riot there had no terrors for him. He was so full of adventure that the combined efforts of both Christians and Asiarchs scarce held him in. On quitting Ephesus, he proceeded to evangelize Troas without seeking any rest. Everything thus shows how well he was in Ephesus, and for a time in Troas also. In the latter town he was struck down by that illness which so nearly proved fatal. The date of it depends on that of the departure from Ephesus. That could not have been later than Pentecost (1 Co 16⁸), nor earlier than the Passover. Most authorities accept the latter date as that for the writing of the First Epistle to the Corinthians. The letter was expected to anticipate the arrival of Timothy, who was then in Macedonia (Ac 19²², 1 Co 4¹⁷ 16¹⁰). As the sea was ‘open’ between 5th March and 10th November, it was likely to be sent by that route. The Epistle failed in its purpose, and Timothy in his mission. Beyschlag, Pfeleiderer, and others think that the latter was insulted in Corinth. If so, a new situation was created and reported to Paul, possibly by Titus or Timothy. The former, indeed, was in that city organizing the ‘collection’ at this time. Thereupon Paul wrote the ‘lost’ or ‘painful’ letter (2 Co 2^{3ff}. 7^{8ff}). Titus may have carried the same to Corinth by sea, as the matter was urgent and navigation still unimpeded. The next tidings is that Paul has left Ephesus, and awaits Titus at Troas. A simple calculation shows that some

eight or ten weeks must have been consumed by these transactions. Add to that, the time spent in evangelizing Troas, which may in part have preceded these events, and the date of the third illness falls about July or August in the year 56 or 57 A.D. The severity of this attack draws forth the pathetic words: 'Death is working in us'; 'our outward man is perishing' (2 Co 4^{12, 16}). *Paul had hitherto entertained the hope of averting the shock of dissolution* (1 Co 15^{61ff.}); *henceforth he renounced it* (2 Co 5^{1ff.}). Meantime his plans were changed; and that involved him in a charge of fickleness (2 Co 1^{15ff.}). He was also called a fool (2 Co 11^{16, 19}). He was further spoken of as insane (2 Co 5¹³). His memory and his reason seem to have been clouded for a season. An improvement in his health permitted him to change from Troas to Philippi in Macedonia. There he had a relapse (2 Co 7⁵), and suffered great depression of spirit. There also he found Luke, who had been left in that city several years earlier. 'The beloved physician' seems to have done him much good during the autumn of this year. Paul's journey from Troas to Assos, through the oak woods of Mount Ida, and his capacity for work otherwise, are proofs of the same. But the residual evil effects are not eliminated; for Luke henceforth continues in close attendance upon him.

These points, then, complete our knowledge of Paul's three illnesses as far as these can be ascertained from Scripture. The descriptions of them are not antagonistic, but supplementary. The apostle declares to the Corinthians what he suffered; to the Galatians what they saw and how they felt. The first enumeration of symptoms is thus *subjective*; the second is *objective*. The two lists naturally differ in detail; but in combination they represent different aspects or stages of one and the same disease. There are also several traditional allusions of early date which seem to be in place in this regard. Thus Tertullian, Jerome, Pelagius, Primasius, Chrysostom, and others mention headache. The antiquity and persistency of these notices, which are not all mere echoes, point to this as an element in the 'infirmity' of Paul. Nicephorus speaks of him as slightly crooked and somewhat stooping, perhaps the result of those illnesses. The whole evidence now begins to indicate Malta fever as the 'infirmity' of Paul.

Malta Fever.—There is distinct evidence that this disease was known to Hippocrates in its epi-

demio form. It haunts the littoral of the Mediterranean Sea, and is also known as 'Mediterranean fever.' It bears likewise a variety of local names, being the 'rock fever' of Gibraltar, the 'Neapolitan fever' of Naples, and the 'country fever' of Constantinople. It frequents the sea-coast and the banks of large rivers, but does not penetrate far inland. It is most common in June, July, and August, though it is not confined to these months. The onset of this fever may be rather sudden or more gradual. Its usual precursors are weariness, headache, pains in the bones and muscles. The person may be able to go about for a time until the increasing illness lays him aside. The headache has now become intense and almost beyond endurance. The weakness progresses till the sufferer becomes listless and loses interest in his surroundings. At the same time, he is restless, irritable, and emotional even to tears. Memory for names and dates is not uncommonly impaired. Delirium is frequent by night. The fever generally increases in the evening and declines towards morning when the patient is bathed in perspiration. After a week or two of these pains and perspirations, the more urgent symptoms abate. The headache becomes less intense, and the delirium ceases. But rheumatic-like pains now invade the joints, both large and small, till almost all have been attacked in succession. Neuralgic pains are felt in various nerves; the sciatic being most frequently attacked. Cutaneous eruptions are not uncommon at this stage; and in nearly every case the hair falls out. The illness may terminate in three weeks or so; but that is exceptional. After a show of convalescence a relapse occurs, and the same series of events is passed through. One relapse may follow another till the succession may spread over eighteen months; but that is unusual. The remanent effects of this fever are excessive debility and anæmia. Pains also in the joints may cause crippling, while there may remain sciatica, facial neuralgia, and affections of other nerves. Yet the risk to life is remarkably slight after all: the mortality being about 2 per cent. Death may occur from acute disease of the heart or the lungs. This fever is sometimes epidemic, but it is no more contagious than malarial fever. The period of incubation may range from six to seventeen days, ten being a common limit. One attack predisposes to others.

Between this description of Malta fever and Paul's 'infirmity' a close parallelism may now be established, despite the scanty and fugitive notices of the latter.

<i>Malta Fever.</i>	<i>Paul's Infirmity.</i>
Haunts river banks and the sea-coast.	Infection at Tarsus, Perga, and Troas.
Fever not strictly seasonal.	Month of the first illness unknown.
Most prevalent when rainfall least.	Second and third illnesses, July or August.
Headache, pains in joints, and muscles.	A stake for the flesh.
Temporary impairment of memory.	Charge of fickleness.
Nocturnal delirium.	Called a madman.
Rheumatic-like pains and neuralgias.	Buffeting of Satan's angel.
Crippling and skin eruptions.	Excitement of contempt and loathing.
Hair commonly falls out.	Traditional feature in Paul's person.
Apparent convalescence.	Removal from Troas to Philippi.
Chronic pains, neuralgias, and debility.	Constant impalement and buffeting.
Occasional endocarditis or pneumonia.	Sentence of death in himself.

Malta Fever.

Fever sometimes epidemic.

Incubation about ten days.

One attack draws on others.

Paul's Infirmity.

Pamphylia to be evangelized again.

Journey from Perga to Pisidian Antioch.

Three illnesses; of increasing severity.

These coincidences are numerous and unforced. The list of them might easily be extended; but these are sufficient to form a sound basis for the induction that the 'infirmity' of Paul was nought else than Malta fever. Its significance is manifold; but its more immediate bearings cannot be indicated here. One point, however, must not be passed over. *Thrice* did the apostle suffer from this malady, and *thrice* did he pray that 'this thing might depart' from him. But the residual effects of these illnesses remained, so that he was 'always being delivered unto death.' Yet in the intervals between these acute attacks, Paul displays the most marvellous energy. Is that then merely a proof of his fortitude and zeal? Surely here is the demonstration that the promise had been fulfilled, 'Sufficient is my grace for thee: for power is perfected in weakness.'

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

ACTS XVI. 30, 31.

'He brought them out, and said, Sirs, what must I do to be saved? And they said, Believe on the Lord Jesus, and thou shalt be saved, thou and thy house.'—R.V.

EXPOSITION.

'He brought them out.'—Not from the house into the street or open air, but from the 'inner' to the 'outer prison,' which was no doubt a more spacious, light, and airy place. This was, therefore, of itself an act of deference, which prepares the way for what subsequently passed between them.—ALEXANDER.

'And said, Sirs, what must I do to be saved?'—By the time that these words were uttered, the jailer's immediate fear for his personal safety must have subsided: but in the quickened consciousness of a moment of great danger, when a man's end seems near, dormant feelings touching his spiritual state and destiny are apt to awake to vivid life. Hence the question, though vague in its purport, and devoid of clear notion touching the 'salvation' of which these calm

men were the heralds, must be taken as having a deeper meaning than concern for bodily safety.—BARTLET.

MORUS, Stolz, Rosenmüller render it: 'in order that I may escape the punishment of the gods on account of your harsh treatment.' But, if Luke desired to have *σωθῶ* and *σωθήσῃ* understood in different senses, he must have appended to *σωθῶ* a more precise definition; for the meaning thus assigned to it suggests itself the less naturally, as the jailer, who had only acted as an instrument under higher direction (comp. Chrysost.), could not reasonably apprehend any vengeance of the gods.—MEYER.

'And they said.'—Silas bore his part.—COOK. 'Believe on the Lord Jesus, and thou shalt be saved.'

'Lord.'—The Greek presents a contrast which is lost in the English. He had called them by the usual title of respect *κύριοι* = sirs, or lords; they answer that there is one *Κύριος*, the Lord Jesus Christ, who alone can save.—ELLICOTT.

THEY lay down faith in Jesus as the condition of *σωτηρία* and nothing else; but saving faith is always in the N.T. that which has holiness as its effect (Ro 6), not 'a human figment and opinion which the depths of the heart never get

to know,' but 'a divine work in us which transforms and begets us anew from God' (Luther's Preface to the Epistle to the Romans) without, however, making justification, which is the act of the imputation of faith, to include sanctification.—MEYER.

'Thou and thy house.'—Though we may suppose that the faith of some members of a household which came over thus *en masse* to an unfamiliar religion was rather crude and impersonal, yet at least it was after hearing 'the word of the Lord' that they were baptized: so with Lydia's household.—BARTLET.

THE SERMON.

The Philippian Gaoler.

By the late Bishop Lightfoot.

What must I do to be saved? was a very strange question to come from such a man as the gaoler of Philippi. Outwardly his case seemed almost hopeless. He had no spiritual insight, and could not even be touched through his sympathies and affections. If a gaoler had any feelings of pity or compassion he had to stifle them, or he would be unfit for his trade. Daily association also with criminals made him hardened and cynical. This gaoler of Philippi was in no way different from other gaolers. When he received Paul and Silas with a command to guard them safely, he obeyed the command to the letter, and beyond the letter. He thrust them into the inner dungeon, and he also made their feet fast in the stocks. What instrumentality, then, laid this self-satisfied and brutal gaoler at Paul's feet with the humble cry of *What must I do to be saved?* The instrumentality was twofold.

1. There was the physical catastrophe, the earthquake, the shaking of the prison, the opening of the doors, and the loosing of the fetters. These things prepared the way. They were not the Lord, but they were His precursors.

2. There was the spiritual influence. The physical catastrophe alone was not enough; it overawed, but it did not inspire. The spiritual influence in this case was the prayer and praise of Paul and Silas. These unwonted sounds had so impressed the gaoler that insensibly they moulded his wakening thoughts.

To us also God speaks in this twofold manner. The physical catastrophe may be sudden bereavement, loss of fortune, or perhaps hairbreadth escape from a threatened danger. The spiritual influence may perhaps come through the life of some heroic friend, or through the voice of the

preacher, and we also cry, 'What must I do to be saved?'

What exactly do we mean by this cry? From what evil do we wish to be saved? Three different senses suggest themselves.

1. We may ask it in reference to temporal affairs. What must I do to save myself from the law, from the loss of my fortune? To this question our text gives no answer.

2. We may ask it of our eternal welfare, and still not ask it in the best way. Our motive may be sheer terror. In that case we ask salvation from the consequences of sin, not salvation from sin.

3. We may ask it in the highest way. What must I do to be delivered from this *my* sin? And if we ask it thus we receive the same answer as did the Philippian gaoler, 'Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved.'

The Simplicity of Faith.

By the Rev. Leonard Woolsey Bacon.

What is Faith? What does it mean to *believe on the Lord Jesus Christ*? There are four tests by which the meaning of the word may be proved.

1. It must be the plain sense of the word, as used by common people.

2. It must be in a sense applicable to the Scriptural examples of faith.

3. It must describe a voluntary act.

4. It must describe an act which practically involves repentance, love, holiness.

Let us now look at some common definitions of faith, so that we may try them by these tests.

i. One of the most usual definitions of faith is that it is the assent of the intellect to truth. But can such be described as a voluntary act? Surely men do not hold their opinions by an act of their will. Neither is it true that the man who holds sound doctrine, who assents with his intellect, is necessarily obedient, holy, and loving.

ii. Another definition is that it is a peculiar quality or intensity of intellectual assent. But that is not using the words of the Bible in their evident sense. Whosoever believeth with saving faith shall have eternal life, are not the words of our Lord.

iii. The third definition is that it is a confident assurance of one's personal salvation. This does not correspond with the facts in the lives of believers, many of the saints having been doubtful

as to their own salvation. Neither is this a free act to which a man may be exhorted as a duty.

iv. The fourth definition is that faith consists in a succession of states of mind and feeling and action. The practical harm of such a definition is that it perplexes plain minds by a complex definition of a simple act. It takes from the unbeliever the burden of guilt by comforting him with the reflexion that he is unfortunate because he has not been hit by religious experience.

What, then, is the real meaning of the words *believe on*? It is simply to trust in. This is the natural meaning of the words as they would be understood by an ordinary person. This meaning is in accordance with the Scriptural examples. In the Old Testament the word *trust* is found 225 times, in the New Testament hardly at all. In the Old Testament *faith* and *believe* are only found a few times, and in the New they occur 700 times. They are just the same words translated differently. Even the most ignorant and the most degraded men and women can trust. It is a voluntary act. By its own nature also it involves repentance, obedience, and holiness. We have an example of this in the classical instance of faith, that of Abraham. Because of his trust he was obedient, not once, but all through his life, step by step. He was not only obedient, he was also holy.

The Heredity of Religion.

By the Rev. George Critchley, B.A.

When we read this text we are apt to miss its concluding words, *and thy house*. In view of the momentous purport of the beginning of the verse we slur over the end, as if it were of no consequence. But when we ponder over the words, we see that they clearly point out a very great responsibility which parents owe to their children. They tell us that there is a spiritual as well as a physical heredity. That the godly father is the cause and secret of the godly family, and that the fine-hearted mother stamps her own moral beauty on the souls of her children. This assertion, however, is not accepted by all, and many examples are cited of the sons and daughters of worthy parents who go far astray. We must admit this fact, but there are three things which may be urged to prove that these exceptions do not vitiate the rule.

1. We believe that, in comparison with the many

instances on the other side, the cases of utter failure of the influence of parental piety are few. They vex us because they are so unexpected. They are like the solitary black spot in a white surface.

2. Then, again, when we are told that many children of godly parents fall away, we must ask the question, did the parents only profess religion, or did they live a truly religious life? Was the parental religion of such a kind as to become the inspiration of the home, or was it a religion of gloom and terror?

3. Even when the children of undeniably good parents go astray, the godly strain is still there. Those who have worked amongst the lost and fallen tell us that the lad and girl who have tender home recollections are most responsive to their appeals.

But, on the other hand, we have the fact urged that some of the noblest Christians come straight out of the darkness. And that is true. We have many examples of it. But still there is always a difference about their religion, a clumsiness and a manifest evidence that the man was not to the manner born. It is in spiritual as it is in temporal matters, the father does not leave the son to climb the ladder afresh from the bottom. He gives him a start; so should the father by living a holy and godly life leave his son a spiritual inheritance, so that at the last day he may be able to answer his Lord's question, 'Are here all thy children?' 'Yes, Lord, all are thine.'

ILLUSTRATIONS.

What must I do?—For many years the Moravian missionaries in Greenland had laboured to train the natives to habits of industry, and to instruct them in the first and simplest truths of religion, studiously withholding from them the deeper mysteries of the Christian faith; but no sensible effect followed. One day, however, whilst one of their number was engaged in making a fair copy of a translation of one of the Gospels, a crowd of natives gathered round him, curious to know the contents of the book. He read to them the history of our Saviour's sufferings and death. 'How was that?' said one of the savages, stepping up to a table at which the missionary was sitting, his voice trembling with emotion as he spoke—'How was that? Tell me that once more, for I too would fain be saved.' 'These words,' writes the missionary, 'the like of which I had never heard from any Greenlander, pierced my very soul, and affected me so much that, with tears in my eyes, I related to them the whole history of the sufferings of Christ, and the counsel of God for our salvation.'—HANNA, *Life of Chalmers*, vol. i. p. 391.

THERE was an old Rabbi who said to his disciples, 'A man should repent the day before he dies.' His disciples said, 'We do not know when we are going to die.' Then said he, 'Repent to-day.'—ALEXANDER MACLAREN.

'Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved.'—The difference between 'believe' and 'believe in' is strongly put in the ancient Waldensian Catechism, long before the Reformation.

A dead faith is to believe that there is a God, and to believe those things which relate to God, and not believe *in* Him.

Q. Dost thou believe in the Holy Catholic Church?

Ans. No; for it is a creature; but I believe there is one.

—MILNER'S *Church History*, Cent. xiii., chap. 3.

ONE day when Napoleon was reviewing his troops in Paris, he let fall the reins of his horse upon the animal's neck, when the proud charger ran away. Before the rider could recover the bridle a common soldier ran out from the ranks, caught the reins, stopped the horse, and placed the reins in the hands of the Emperor. 'Much obliged to you, captain,' said Napoleon. The man immediately believed the chief, and said, 'Of what regiment, sire?' Napoleon, delighted with his quick perception and manly trust in his word, said, 'Of my Guards,' and rode away. As soon as the Emperor left, the soldier laid down his gun, saying, 'He may take it who will,' and started at once for the company of the staff officers, and duly came to his post as captain of Napoleon's Guard.—J. ELLIS.

THE celebrated Dr. Johnson, at the beginning of his last illness, found that he had not peace with God, or any assured righteousness to satisfy his conscience. Accordingly he sought help from Mr. Winstanley, the good Rector of St. Dunstan's in the East. He was too unwell to comply with Johnson's request for a visit, but the messages he sent were

the means of leading the great moralist and man of letters to the Cross. His first reply, with which all others would correspond, was, 'Behold the lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world.' 'Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved.'—J. F. B. TINLING.

FOR REFERENCE.

- Bacon (L. W.), The Simplicity that is in Christ, 24.
 Banks (L. A.), The Great Saints of the Bible, 297.
 Burton (J.), Christian Life and Truth, 146.
 Campbell (J. M.), Bible Questions, 99.
 Church (R. W.), Village Sermons, 47.
 Cooper (S.), Fifty-two Family Sermons, 195.
 Critchley (G.), When the Angels have gone away, 155.
 De Quetteville (R. W.), Short Studies on Vital Subjects, 88.
 Evans (R. W.), Parochial Sermons, 266.
 Finney (C. G.), Sermons on Gospel Themes, 161.
 Fraser (J.), Scotch Sermons on the Old Lines, 3.
 Gregory (J. R.), Scripture Truths made Simple, 165.
 Hannam (R.), Pulpit Assistant.
 Haslam (W.), The Threefold Gift of God, 13.
 Hutcheson (J. T.), A View of the Atonement, 194.
 Kirk (J.), Sermons, 281.
 Leach (C.), Sunday Afternoons with Working Men, 259.
 Lightfoot (J. B.), Sermons in St. Paul's Cathedral, 230.
 MacLaren (A.), After the Resurrection, 281.
 Maurice (F. D.), Acts of the Apostles, 255.
 Parkhurst (C. H.), The Blind Man's Creed, 49.
 Pearse (M. G.), The Gospel for the Day, 229.
 Perren (C.), Seed Corn for the Sower.
 „ „ Revival Sermons, 278.
 Reeve (J. W.), Forty-two Sermons, 97.
 Robertson (F. D.), Lectures and Addresses, 1.
 Robinson (S.), Discourses on Redemption, 321.
 Trench (R. C.), Sermons Preached in Ireland, 142.
 Vaughan (C. J.), Church of the First Days, 301.
 Winterbotham (R.), Sermons, 305.

The Rendering of $\delta\epsilon$ in the New Testament.

BY THE REV. HERBERT G. MILLER, M.A., CAMBRIDGE.

IT is the object of this paper to put forward a plea for at least a more general recognition in New Testament translation of the adversative meaning of the particle $\delta\epsilon$, which occurs about 2700 times, and is generally rendered as a simple conjunction, with the result that the meaning of many passages is, for the purely English reader, weakened, obscured, or even totally lost.

For an extreme case we may refer to Mt 20⁴, where a very different complexion from that currently assigned will be put on the parable by rendering the last clause, '*but they went away.*' The English versions would suggest that they went

into the vineyard; but the real teaching is quite opposite. 'They went away,' as went the rich young man whose story, related in the chapter preceding, gave immediate occasion to this parable. 'But when the young man heard the saying, he *went away.*' The self-same word is used here of the labourers. They had neglected, refused, or in some way had missed, the first call—made 'early in the morning' of the day of their life; and the warning from their conduct is, that they who miss the first call—who fail to serve the Lord in their childhood, will be prone to turn away from the later calls, and follow on their course of self-

indulgence, until at the last hour, it may be, their self-disgust and the contemptuous neglect of their fellow-men compel their response to the strange mercy of a God willing even at this last to receive them (20⁷). The neglected adversativeness of the particle, and the shallow rendering of it by *and*, though assuredly designed to bring out into contrast the willingness of the householder to hire and the unwillingness of the labourers to labour, has led commentators greatly astray, and obscured for all ordinary readers the plain, direct teaching of the parable, with its warning of the danger of delay in responding to the call of the Lord.

Comparing Mt 20⁴ with Mt 28¹⁷ one is roused to high wonder at the inconsistency of rendering οἱ δὲ ἀπῆλθον by '*and they went their way*,' in the first case, and the strictly parallel οἱ δὲ ἐδίστασαν in the second, by '*but some doubted*.' Render consistently the οἱ δὲ in each case as '*but they*,' and we learn from the second the important lesson that they doubted who worshipped, and, furthermore, that they worshipped who doubted. A lesson most instructive to many. There are those who no sooner are conscious of a doubt as to the reality of the claims of Christ Jesus than they instantly cease from His worship, counting it an insincerity to call upon His name concerning whose position they are doubtful. But until the doubt has been decided—until *doubt* has given place to *disbelief*—there is that in their minds which warrants and calls for their worship, while at the same time there is that which calls for thought and investigation. When doubt has ceased, then, only then, should worship cease. The hesitancy of His first disciples to accept the evidence of their senses to the Resurrection of Jesus gives weight to their final, unswerving conviction, and our conviction is made stronger by this record concerning them, that 'when they saw Him, they worshipped Him: but they doubted.'

The same unaccountable rendering of οἱ δὲ by '*but some*' is found in the margin of Mk 10³² (R.V.), an objectionable alternative for the objectionable rendering, '*and they*,' in the text. The pictorial effect of the accepted reading (οἱ δὲ for καὶ) is ruined both in text and margin. There is a general description of the entire group as 'in the way, going up to Jerusalem,' followed by a resolution of the group into (1) the solitary figure of Jesus, pressing forward in advance of all (ἦν προάγων αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς); (2) those who were standing

amazed in the way, distinguished by the δέ from (3) those who followed Jesus.

In Lk 3²¹ the vapid rendering, '*Now it came to pass*,' destroys the fine suggestive contrast between the closed prison and the opened heaven. 'He shut up John in prison. *But* it came to pass, when all the people were baptized, that, Jesus also having been baptized, and praying, the heaven was opened.' In Mt 11^{2, 7, 11, 12} we find the particle rendered, apparently at random, by '*now*,' '*and*,' '*yet*,' '*and*,' with a loss of meaning in each case, which is serious. The obvious design of the δέ in v.² is to contrast the unimpeded, continuous work of the Master, as described in v.¹, with the now finally arrested work of His forerunner. In v.⁷ the δέ is used to mark a change from the tone of wholesome sternness in the stimulating message sent to meet the misgivings of the Baptist. To the listening multitudes this tone of subdued rebuke or remonstrance would convey an utterly false conception of the Baptist's true nature and character. It was the only tone in which to rally him from mood of despondency, and so He spoke in the presence of His messengers. '*But* as these were going their way, Jesus began to say unto the *multitudes* concerning John . . . ?' The contrast is between the message sent to John when under a passing fit of depression, and the public tribute to the grandeur of his character as a whole.

The needless rendering of δέ by '*yet*' in v.¹¹ has led to fatal tampering with the meaning of μικρότερος. Translate as follows: 'Verily I say unto you, Among them that are born of women there hath not arisen a greater than John the Baptist: but (howbeit) he that is less in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he.' The contrast here is between those 'born of women,' and those 'in the kingdom of heaven'—between those born of the flesh and those born of the Spirit. In the greatness of his natural character John stands without a rival in history. Belonging to him as man was a forcefulness, a directness of aim, a fearlessness of spirit, in which none can challenge comparison with him. But what marked him as a *man of God* was humility—the utter absence of self-regarding motives and impulses. In this one respect he is imitable, and if any can exceed him in this, can make of himself less than the Baptist did, he will have won his way to spiritual pre-eminence. Incomparable as was the Baptist in those gifts which were his natural

birthright, in his lowliness of mind he may be emulated, and spiritual superiority will belong to the man who in respect of this grace can surpass him. Then the $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ of the next verse, again adversative, not conjunctive, implies, '*It was not so in days of old*, but, from the days of John until now the kingdom of heaven suffereth force, and forceful men seize it.' The demands made upon men by the prophets required strength of will and moral earnestness for their accomplishment. But such demands are made now as no man's nature will suffice to meet. No sturdy output of moral energy will qualify now for membership in the kingdom, but only a consciousness of deficiency leading to a seeking and receiving of 'that thing which by nature we cannot have.'

In Mt 4¹² the nerveless 'now' destroys the vivid contrast between the angels ministering unto Him and the crowded activities of His life (who came 'not to be ministered unto, but to minister'), of which a compendious description is given in the following verses.

With a perverse ingenuity the rendering is varied to 'and' in v.¹⁸ to the destruction of the contrast between the silent, diffused influence of that light of life which shone from His home in Capernaum, and the influence of the direct, personal appeals which He proceeds to make to individuals.

In 1 Co 3²³ the twofold 'and' is clearly erroneous and subversive of the sense. The force of $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ is to restrict, restrain, modify the meaning of the clause preceding 'All things are yours, but ye are Christ's, but Christ is God's.' The 'all things are yours,' if left standing alone, would have opened the door to much licence, so a double guard is set about it. 'All things are yours,' but for the use to which ye put them ye are responsible. The play of self-will is excluded. 'All things are yours,' but ye yourselves are 'not your own.' It is not to any mere man that ye are subject (vv.⁴ seq.), but directly and alone to Christ, the God-man, and then, through Christ, to God.

A finely rhetorical 'but' has been displaced by 'now' in Eph 3²⁰. He had bowed his knees to God in prayer, and had stretched his petitions to the utmost. *But* when he had reached his own limit of praying, he had not reached to the limit of prayer. He had bowed his knees in prayer, and had mounted from petition to petition

until the definite, the finite, touched the verge of the infinite (v.¹⁹). Such and such had been his definite petitions (vv.¹⁶⁻¹⁹), but beyond all that was definite lay the infinite. 'I bow my knees and pray for this and that, but I appeal to a love which passeth knowledge, to a beneficent power which exceeds desire and transcends all thought.' The contrast lies between his definite praying and his solemn inarticulate appeal for higher blessings, undesired because by us at present not conceivable—to be realized only by a spontaneous grant of them. Another noticeable loss in the rendering of this particle is in He 1⁶. The First Advent, referred to in v.⁵, had not issued in an open triumph, had failed to meet men's expectations or to satisfy their desires. '*But* when he shall have again brought in the firstborn into the world, he saith,' etc. The contrast is between the First Advent, culminating in the personal triumph of the Resurrection, and the Second, which will be marked by the fulness of His sovereign triumph. In Jn 4⁵¹ the vividness of the picture is sadly impaired by the colourless 'and.' Render 'The man believed the word that Jesus spake unto him, and set forth on his way. But while he was now going down,' etc. Above, in *ver.* 4, an emphasis thrown by $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ upon the mysterious $\xi\delta\epsilon\iota$ which compelled Him to despise Samaria, is sacrificed to the persistent 'and.' 'He forsook ($\alpha\phi\eta\kappa\epsilon$) Judea, and departed again for (unto) Galilee. But he must needs pass through Samaria.'

Twice only is justice done to this particle in Ac 12^{5, 24}, a chapter in which the use of it is particularly frequent and interesting. In v.¹, for the irritating 'now' let 'but' be used, and a telling contrast at once is yielded between the picture of sweet Christian charity, with which the chapter preceding is concluded, and the murderous ferocity of Herod the king. Again, in v.², for 'and' read 'but,' and we get the intended contrast between the mere 'afflicting' of those others and the death by the sword meted out to St. James. In v.³ the first $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ suggests that the first execution was tentative, and the effect of it anxiously awaited; then in contrast comes the boldness of subsequent action under the encouragement of Jewish approval. The second $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$, at the close of the verse, assigns a reason for the persecution not spreading more widely. The inclination was there, '*but* those were the days of unleavened bread.' In v.⁵, thanks

no doubt to the fortunate presence of *μέν* in the first clause, *δέ* is allowed to be 'but,' with remarkable effect, in the second. The king's power was holding him, and behind the king the might of Rome itself was gathered, 'but prayer was made earnestly of the church unto God for him.' That was all that interposed between Peter and destruction—prayer, in the efficacy of which not even 'the church' was believing. We are reminded of the effective 'but' in Ezra 5⁵ (E.V.). The *δέ* at the commencement of v.⁶ points to a train of thought left unexpressed. The movement of the story is rapid. Here was Peter, on the eve of execution, lying fettered and chained under military guardianship; here was the church engaged in feeble, hopeless, futile-seeming prayer; 'but . . . the same night Peter was sleeping.' The contrast is between the watchful malevolence of Herod, the trepidation and dismay of the Christian community, and the calm composure of the threatened man.

It is true that *δέ* is often used merely to introduce a fresh subject, and to mark the transition from one to the other, and in our less sensitive English the idea of difference may then with advantage be neglected, and the *and, now*, etc., be a wholly legitimate rendering; but this *δέ* transitional is not of frequent occurrence. We may fairly recognize it in Ac 12⁶, but not in *ver.* 8, if *δέ* be the right reading, for it distinguishes between that which, being impossible for himself to do, was miraculously done for him, and that which being now within the scope of his power, he was ordered himself to perform. Again, in v.¹⁰ the actual passage through the wards is opposed to Peter's thought of a *vision*. In v.¹⁸ *δέ* is needlessly weakened to 'and.' 'Many were gathered together and were praying. *But*' the prayer had been already granted. Then in vv.¹⁴⁻¹⁶ the vigour of the narrative is much impaired wherever 'and' is put in place of 'but.' The hurried play of conflicting emotions and the description of different actions are set with forceful brevity before us, contrasted clauses being placed most effectively together. 'And when she knew Peter's voice, she opened not the gate for joy, but ran in, and told that Peter stood before the gate. *But* they said unto her, Thou art mad. *But* she confidently affirmed that it was so. *But* they said, It is his angel. *But* Peter continued knocking: *but* when they had opened, they saw him, and were amazed.'

It would be pedantic in English to take *δέ* in

vv.^{18, 19} as marking more than a transition from this scene of a joy that was passing belief to the consternation of the soldiers (v.¹⁸), and from that to the baffled fury of Herod (v.¹⁹). The full effect of the Greek particle, however, is to *call attention* to this juxtaposition of a series of contrasted pictures, though we cannot in English reproduce it. 'Now,' 'and,' 'and' fairly represent the purely transitional use of the particle in vv.²⁰⁻²². Not so in v.²³, where 'but' should be, beyond all doubt, the rendering: 'The people shouted, saying, The voice of a god, and not of a man. *But* immediately an angel of the Lord smote him, because he gave not the glory to God.' The contrast here painted is lurid between the people and the angel; between Herod at one moment being deified, complacently accepting the impious homage, and at the next his being smitten to corruption and loathsomeness.

How great would have been the loss if 'and' had been for 'but' in the following verse. How tremendous is the contrast which it makes between the once boastful tyrant arrayed in royal apparel, and seated on the throne, but a soulless (*ἐξέψυχεν*), worm-eaten corpse, only left of him now, and 'the Word of the (true) God,' which he had set himself to stifle, growing steadfastly on, and being multiplied. In Ro 3^{21, 22}, our translators have taken the second *δέ* as simply parallel with the first, and rendered it by 'even.' This, of course, is possible, but seems by no means necessary. A better meaning, I think, to be yielded, and one which carries on the argument by rendering: 'But now apart from the law God's righteousness hath been manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; but God's righteousness is through faith of Jesus Christ unto all them that believe.' This righteousness is *witnessed*, indeed, by the law, but still itself is distinct, separate from the law, being 'through faith of Jesus Christ.' The last clause in v.²⁰ is parallel. The outcome of the law is consciousness of sin, but the outcome of faith in Jesus Christ is the righteousness of God.

In the combination *καὶ . . . δέ* which is occasionally found, the *καὶ* at once introduces new matter, and co-ordinates it with that preceding, while the *δέ* retains its full adversative force. For instance, in Mt 10¹⁸, *καὶ ἐπὶ ἡγεμόνας δὲ καὶ βασιλεῖς ἀχθήσεσθε*, the *δέ* contrasts the civil powers with the ecclesiastical mentioned above. We might render, 'Nor is this all, but . . . ' So

in Jn 6⁵¹ 7¹⁶⁻¹⁷ 15²⁷, Ac 3²⁴, 1 Jn 1⁸, 3 Jn 12, 2 P 1⁵.

It may be said, in conclusion, that δέ never loses its adversative force. Even when it is only transitional, it makes the *difference* between the subject concluded and that now introduced. This δέ transitional must sometimes be rendered as a

simple conjunction, but always with a loss of some fine shade of meaning due to the inferior sensitive-ness of the English language. With what needless frequency the loss of adversativeness of this particle has been inflicted on the English reader, the few foregoing illustrations will suffice to show. They might be multiplied endlessly.

Recent Biblical and Oriental Archaeology.

BY PROFESSOR A. H. SAYCE, LL.D., OXFORD.

Discoveries in Palestine.

DR. SELLIN has just published his account of the excavations which he undertook for the Imperial Academy of Vienna at Tell Ta'annek, the ancient Taanach, and a very important monograph it is.¹ Begun in 1902 the work involved two campaigns, though the second, in 1903, had to be carried on at high pressure, as the German expedition was anxious to begin excavating at the neighbouring Tell el-Mutasellim, the site of the ancient Megiddo, and needed Dr. Sellin's workmen. Fortunately, Tell Ta'annek represented one of the smaller Canaanitish towns, and its area is consequently not large, so that the Austrian explorers were able to examine it thoroughly.

The English excavations in the south of Palestine have determined the main outlines of Palestinian archæology and the chronological succession of the pottery. But the work at Tell Ta'annek, while receiving help from the results of English exploration, has confirmed and supplemented them, and shown that except in certain details the character and history of civilization in both southern and northern Canaan were the same. The ancient history of Taanach has been recovered in a way that would have seemed impossible but a few years ago, and we can now trace its fortunes from the time of the first foundation of the city to the day of its fall.

No remains of a 'prehistoric' age have been found such as have been discovered in Judah. The founders of the city were already acquainted with the use of metal, though the hundreds of

flint flakes and knives that have been met with, more especially near the walls of the buildings, show that the Neolithic age had not been long left behind. But a Babylonian seal-cylinder of about 2000 B.C., bearing the inscription, 'Atanakhili, son of Khabsim, servant of Nergal,' which was found along with geometric pottery in the ruins of the north-eastern tower, bears testimony to contact with Babylonia and Babylonian culture, while the Egyptian hieroglyphs, with which the cylinder is adorned, is further evidence that Babylonia and Egypt were at the time in friendly relations.

The earliest pottery is red, often decorated with incised lines, the vases being characterized by flat bottoms and 'wavy' handles. The incisions sometimes take the form of palm-leaf and rope patterns. I have found similar incised pottery in the prehistoric remains of Hierakonpolis, in Upper Egypt, and it is also met with in the earlier stratum of Melos. The incised pottery is followed by the painted 'geometric,' with yellowish-white or red slip and brown-red patterns, or red slip with black patterns, and vases with pointed feet now first occur. In what Dr. Sellin regards as the second city or 'layer of culture,' the Ægean 'ladder' ornament becomes frequent, painted in brown upon an olive-coloured ground, and the linear characters found on the early pottery of Judah and Egypt, as well as on the pre-Mykenæan pottery of Melos, make their appearance.²

¹ 'Tell Ta'annek,' in the *Denkschriften d. K. Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien*, L. iv. (Vienna, 1904).

² So far, however, as I can judge from the uncoloured illustrations, this pottery of the second 'stratum' at Tell Ta'annek would correspond with the Mykenæan, or even Late Mykenæan of the Ægean area. Roughly speaking, the

Between these earlier strata and the third and last in the history of the Tell, there is a sharp difference. The pottery of the third stratum is Cypriote of the Phœniko-Greek age (1000-600 B.C.), and iron has begun to take the place of bronze. It is in this stratum that two remarkable terra-cotta altars were found, the more perfect of which is ornamented on each of the two sides with a row of 'cherubim,'—human-headed animals with wings alternating with lions,—while on the front is the tree of life with a leaping goat beside it, and on the left side is a boy or man grasping the neck of a snake and trampling upon its tail. The custom of burying infants in jars under the walls of a house, with a cup and dish at the side, of which Mr. Macalister has also found evidences at Gezer, seems to have ceased with the introduction of the new epoch of life and culture.

In the Roman period the Tell appears to have been deserted, a new town springing up, as elsewhere, on the plain below it. Here in a cistern Dr. Sellin discovered a number of fragments of what he rightly regards as Byzantine pottery. Towards the tenth century, however, an Arab fortress was erected on the highest point of the old city, which, after existing for a century or two, was probably destroyed in the time of the Crusades. Some interesting pieces of mediæval Arab ware were disinterred from its ruins.

To myself the most interesting discovery made by Dr. Sellin is naturally that of four cuneiform tablets which were found in the remains of a fortified building on the north side of the hill. Under the fort was an elaborate underground series of chambers, partly excavated in the rock, with stairs and cistern, which was evidently intended as a place of refuge for the women and children in time of siege. In one of the rooms of the fort a broken terra-cotta coffer was discovered, with its lid lying beside it, and at the bottom of it the

succession of pottery found by the Austrian explorers answers fairly well to that of the Ægean, if we omit the polychrome 'Kamares' or 'Minoan' pottery of Krete. We begin with the incised ware called Amorite by Petrie, who met with it in the oldest strata of Lachish; this is followed by early geometric, this again by Mykenæan, and this by Cypriote. In 1500-1400 B.C., the age of the cuneiform tablets, the pottery of the place was still the early incised. The population that used this incised ware was the Dolichocephalic people of short stature, whose remains are met with in the oldest graves of Krete, Melos, etc., and who represent the Mediterranean race of Sergi.

fragments of two cuneiform tablets. At a little distance from it two other tablets were found. The latter were perfect, and turned out to be letters, the fragmentary tablets being official lists. It was clear that the coffer was the place in which the records of the archive-chamber were kept; it was, in fact, the library of Taanach, which must have been broken and plundered of its contents on some occasion when the Canaanitish fortress was taken by storm. The clay tablets containing official lists discovered by Dr. A. J. Evans in the palace of Knossos were kept in similar receptacles.

The tablets were associated with the earliest pottery of Tell Ta'annek,—that with incised patterns,—as well as with a bronze knife, an Egyptian amulet of the New Empire, and two alabaster vases, one of eighteenth, the other of tenth, dynasty shape. Dr. Sellin assumes that the tablets belong to the Tel el-Amarna epoch: but this is by no means necessarily the case. There is nothing in their contents which points to Egyptian supremacy, and they may therefore be either earlier or later than the age of Khu-n-aten. The introduction of Babylonian culture and writing into Canaan goes back at least as early as the time of Khammu-rabi. At the same time the Egyptian objects found in the fortress point to the age of the eighteenth dynasty.

The tablets have been edited by Dr. Hrozný, with the help of Professor Zimmern. His translation of the first letter is as follows:—'To Istarwasur (or Istar-yisur) thus says Guli-Addi (Hadad). Live happily! May the gods welcome thee, thy house and thy sons! Thou hast written to me in regard to the silver, . . . and now I will give fifty pieces of silver, since it has not been done (before). Again, why hast thou (anew?) sent me here thy salutation, for everything which thou hast heard from that place I know through the hand of Bel-ram. Again, if the finger (omen) of Asirat (Asherah) shows itself, may they learn and observe (it)! And the sign and the result thou shall tell me. As to thy daughter, we know (her) who is in Rubutê (Rabbah), namely, Salmisa, and if she grows up thou wilt give her to be queen; she verily is for a lord.'

The sense of the second letter has not been always understood by the editor, whose translation of it accordingly must be amended. My own rendering is: 'To Istar-yisur thus says Akh-yami: May the lord of the gods protect thy life; a

brother art thou, and love is deeply in thee (*literally*, in the entrails) and in thy heart. When I was entering Gurra (see 2 K 9²⁷), a workman gave me two knives (?), a shield and two sheaths (?) for nothing, and if the shield which he has made is complete, I will forward it by the hand of Buridi. Again, there is lamentation to thy city, but, in fact, they have committed their deed against me, each one who has committed it against the cities. Now, behold and see that I have acted well towards thee. Again, if I show my face (?), they will be put to shame, and the plague will be strong (on them). Again, let Ilurabi go down to the city of Rakhabi (Rehob), and then he will send my agent to thee, and they (*or* he) will make a defensive league.' On the edge of the tablet seems to be a request for the speedy departure of the messenger: 'Let (him) go, let (him) go!'

The two official lists, or inventories, are still more interesting, as they show that in Canaan, as in Babylonia, business accounts and official records were kept in the language and script of the Babylonians. Like the letters, they are a proof of the wide extent to which the cuneiform system of writing was known in the country, even the sheikhs of third-rate towns corresponding in it with one another and using it for business purposes. It is significant that in Krete, though the clay tablet was borrowed from Babylonia, native systems of script were employed. Canaan had once been a province of the Babylonian empire, while Krete was only distantly affected by Babylonian literary culture.

One of the lists gives the number of men the persons enumerated in it were required to furnish for the militia; among them are Zirayi, 'the Bedâwi,' and Yimi-banda, 'the king,' who, however, could not have exercised much royal authority, as he was expected to furnish only one man. The editor has misunderstood the fragmentary words at the end of the list; they really form part of a date, and read: 'the first day' of such and such a month, 'the beginning' of the reign of such and such a king. In the second list mention is made of the gods Addu or Hadad and Amon, whose name is written Yimuna.

For Palestinian archaeology, two facts disclosed by the excavations at Tell Ta'annek stand out with special importance. One is the association of the cuneiform tablets with the oldest pottery of

the mound, the other the Cypriote-Greek influence which comes in with the Israelitish occupation of the place. Traces of the same influence, though to a far less extent, have been met with by the English excavators in the south of Palestine. Here, on the other hand, the period of geometric pottery reaches back to a considerably earlier date than would seem to have been the case at Taanach. This geometric pottery was, in the first instance, either imported from abroad or else imitated from foreign models, and, wherever it was introduced, soon succeeded in superseding the wretched native pottery of the country. While belonging to the pre-Mykenæan class of pottery that was once predominant throughout the whole of the Ægean area, it must have come to Canaan from some other region than the Ægean itself. Not only does it differ in details from the Ægean 'geometric,' but there is no trace of the beaked jugs which were characteristic of the Ægean region, much less of the 'Kamâres' or 'Minoan' pottery of Krete.¹ On the other hand, Mr. Welch has indicated points of contact between it and the earlier pottery of Cyprus (*Annual of the British School at Athens*, No. vi. pp. 117 *sqq.*), but its nearest analogies are to be found in the geometric pottery of Boghaz Keui, the Hittite stronghold in northern Cappadocia (see Chantre, *Mission en Cappadoce*, pl. iii.). What makes the similarity the more striking is that at Kara Eyuk, a little to the north-east of Kaisariyeh, from which a number of cuneiform tablets have come, showing that an Assyrian colony was established there in the Tel el-Amarna age or earlier, the types of pottery are different, the geometric ware being more specifically 'Ægean,' while the beaked jug was common. M. Chantre also found Naukratite pottery at Kara Eyuk as well as Mykenæan, which last is picked up on ancient sites throughout Asia Minor, as Professor Ramsay has assured me.

From the evidence of the pottery we may, there-

¹ The polychrome pottery of Lachish and Gezer, in contradistinction to the Shephelah tells, can have been only indirectly influenced, if at all, by that of Krete, designs and ceramic forms displaying no very close resemblance in the two cases. The polychrome birds and fish of this Lachish-Gezer pottery, however, are noticeable, more especially the fish which point to the origin of the ware amongst a maritime population. Compare, for instance, the fish in P.E.F. *Quarterly Statement* for October 1902, pl. 4, No. 7, with those from Knossos in the *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, xiii. p. 198.

fore, conclude (1) that the pre-Mykenæan geometric was introduced into southern Palestine at an earlier date than into the north, or, at all events, into Taanach, and (2) that it was brought southward from the Hittite area in Asia Minor.

Before I leave Dr. Sellin and his discoveries, there are three other points to which attention should be directed. He has found no jar-handles with Hebrew inscriptions. At Gezer also, where jar-handles with scarab stamps occur pretty plentifully in the Amorite stratum, those with Hebrew inscriptions are almost entirely absent. We must accordingly regard them not only as distinctively Jewish—a fact which we knew before, but also as comparatively late. Support is thus given to my theory that they emanated from the 'royal' potteries to which reference is made in 1 Ch 4^{22, 23}. Then secondly, an unusually large number of terra-cotta figures of Ashtoreth have been disinterred, from which (coupled with the absence of figures of Baal) Dr. Sellin infers that the population of Taanach was specially devoted to the worship of the goddess. Similar figures have been found by Mr. Macalister in the fourth stratum at Gezer. Thirdly, very few scarabs have been met with by the Austrian explorers. This is strikingly in contrast with what is the case in the tells of southern Palestine where scarabs are numerous, more particularly at Gezer. Here, indeed, they belong, for the most part, to the Amorite period represented by the fourth stratum, though many have also been found in the third and fifth strata, and the greater number of them are of the Hyksos age, testifying to close intercourse at that time between Egypt and southern Palestine. It was in the fourth stratum that the megalithic temple at Gezer was completed in which an Egyptian stela of the twelfth dynasty was found.¹

¹ For those who have not read Mr. Macalister's Reports, it is as well to state that the third stratum at Gezer follows immediately upon the Neolithic period, and corresponds with the earlier stratum at Lachish; it is the period of the incised pottery, and of the introduction of bronze. The fourth stratum represents the age of Amorite supremacy, and is

I must, however, reserve any discussion of the excavations of the Palestine Exploration Fund at Gezer until they are brought to a conclusion, since each of Mr. Macalister's Reports throws new light upon the problems of Canaanitish history, and sometimes modifies the provisional inferences he had previously drawn. It is to be hoped that the Committee will have no difficulty in procuring funds for a work which has already had important and unexpected results, and has done more to clear up disputed questions of Old Testament archæology than volumes of learned controversy. Meanwhile, I cannot pass over in silence the broken cuneiform tablet which turned up this spring in the Jewish stratum. It belongs to the age of the Second Assyrian Empire, and records the sale of houses and other property. The names of the vendors, as well as those of some of the witnesses, are Assyrian, but the names of other witnesses are North Syrian, not Canaanite. The deed is dated the 17th of Sivan in the eponymy following that of Assur-dur-utsur, 649 B.C. according to Mr. George Smith, at a time when Manasseh was on the throne of Judah and Palestine was an Assyrian province.²

characterized by Egyptian scarabs and other objects of the Middle Empire and Hyksos age. In the fifth stratum, in which iron first begins to be used, we have Israelitish pottery, including the 'lamps and bowls' which first occur at Lachish in the fourth stratum above the great layer of ashes proved by Petrie to be a memorial of the destruction of the city by the Israelites. The polychrome pottery of the Shephelah tells, in which the outlines are not filled in as in the Gezer-Lachish pre-Israelitish ware, Mr. Macalister now believes to be subsequent to the Israelitish conquest.

² Since the above was written Mr. J. L. Myres has published an important article on 'The Early Pot-Fabrics of Asia Minor' in the *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xxxiii. pp. 367-400, in which he shows that the polychrome (or more strictly trichrome) pottery of Palestine and the Egyptian Delta, which he calls 'Syro-Cappadocian,' came from the neighbourhood of the Hittite capital at Boghaz Keui, north of the Halys, where the red pigment characterizing it was still found in classical days. He thus arrives by a different road at the same conclusion as myself.

At the Literary Table.

Cuneiform Texts.¹

Six years ago Professor Hilprecht and Dr. A. T. Clay edited a number of most interesting business documents dealing with the affairs of an old Babylonian family, who lived in Nippur, in the reign of Artaxerxes I., 464-424 B.C. This volume gives a series of similar documents relating to the commercial transactions of the same family in the reign of Darius II., 424-404 B.C. It is superbly got up, and, as in the former volume, the texts have been copied with exquisite skill. They are now accompanied by an invaluable list of signs enabling anyone to read them with perfect ease.

From the sign list it is possible to note the remarkable changes which Babylonian handwriting had undergone since the days of Nebuchadnezzar and the early Persian monarchs. In other respects, save for the presence of many Persians, social conditions seem to have been changed very little by the invasion of Cyrus. A few official titles and one or two words came into use, for which Persian origin must be assumed. Some revivals of old institutions occur. Thus the system of holding land on condition of furnishing a bowman as quota to the army—which held in Assyria before the fall of Nineveh, but for which evidence seems lacking in Babylonia for the next two centuries—was again in full force. This suggests the question whether Sargon's conquest of Persia had introduced there Assyrian military tenure and organization, and so laid the foundation of the future Persian supremacy.

Of deep interest, as in vol. ix., is the accurate list of proper names, which were borne by the parties to the deeds recorded in this collection of texts. They were of many different nationalities. Beside native Babylonians, and of course Persians, are many names like those of Aramæans or Canaanites. Many are closely paralleled by biblical names. Professor Hilprecht contributes a deeply interesting preface and many valuable notes

¹ *Business Documents of Murashû Sons.* By Professor A. T. Clay. Vol. x. of 'Series A: Cuneiform Texts. Edited by Professor A. V. Hilprecht, of the Babylonian Expedition of the University of Philadelphia. Published by the Department of Archaeology of the University of Philadelphia, 1904, with the support of the Eckley Brinton Cox, Junior, Fund.

to the index of proper names. Whether his views will stand the test of time and further knowledge, or not, we cannot be too grateful for his suggestions. Professor Clay holds different views on some points, and the data are carefully set out for others to decide between them. This is a most important branch of study, for proper names embody ancient history, often of the highest significance. That much discussed passage in 2 Ki 19³⁷, which narrates the tragic end of Sennacherib, once more provokes a guess. All respect is due to every opinion formulated by Professor Hilprecht on the subject of proper names, which his unrivalled collections render difficult to dispute. Readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES may recall a plea for information in vol. ix. p. 425, as to the reasons why a certain Assyrian god, whose name perpetually occurs at all periods, was ever supposed to be called Adar. There is very little doubt that the chief, if not the only, reason was to be found in this biblical passage. Adramelech had to be accounted for as the name of a son of Sennacherib. To do that an Assyrian god Adar was assumed. No god whose name was known from the inscriptions was called Adar. But one god whose name was written ideographically, was not identified with any Assyrian god known from the Bible. It was guessed, therefore, that he was called Adar. It was known, however, that the same god bore a name written Nin-ib, or Nin-ip. Cautious Assyriologists held that even that might not have been pronounced as written. Now the Aramaic 'dockets,' or endorsements, on four tablets of this collection show, for the first time, that, at any rate in the Persian period, the god's name was pronounced entirely differently from either Adar or Ninib.

What the name really was is still hard to say. Aramaic 'dockets' are tricky things. Scratched on terra cotta with a fine point, or dashed on with a writing fluid that has not remained distinct, they deceive the most expert eye. The professors differ. Professor Hilprecht would make the name read ANRŠH, which recalls the known name NINŠAH and the Syriac NARŠG. He thinks it may be the name intended by the biblical name Nisroch. But there is as little likelihood that Nisroch was ever the name of any god whom Sennacherib worshipped

as that he had a son called Adrammelech. Professor Clay would read the name ANUŠT. The excellent copies of these Aramaic 'dockets' on p. xviii seem to support his reading. We are as far off as ever. We know of no name of a god that can credibly be held to have produced such an Aramaic spelling. In the present state of uncertainty as to what the Aramaic signs really were, a tentative suggestion may be thrown out. Can they really be AURŠT? The syllabaries tell us that in earlier times the signs written NIN-IB were pronounced URAŠ. If the god had become a goddess as we know to have been the case with other gods, in the lapse of time the name URAŠ might have acquired a feminine ending. The initial A is a difficulty. But the other Aramaic 'dockets' published show that at this time AUR was the pronunciation of a divine name ideographically written KUR-GAL, and therefore conjecturally read hitherto as *šadû rabû*. There is evidence to show that this god was not native Babylonian, but West Semitic, and Professor Clay aptly compares Uru in Uru-milki, a West Semitic name. If AUR be read Uru, AURŠT might well be read Uraštu.

The selected documents are transliterated and translated by Professor Clay with great care and generally very happy renderings. The discussion of proper names is most valuable for students of the Bible as well as for specialists. The acuteness and learning displayed are deserving of all praise. One is inclined to be content with thanks and congratulations.

A few criticisms may be allowed as a contribution to accuracy. There are not a few misprints. These will not usually mislead the reader. Experience shows that they cannot be charged against the author. Apparently American printers are too independent to accept corrections of proofs. It may be pointed out that the sign KAD was already shown to have the values *tađ, tat*, by Pinches, in the *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*, vol. xviii. p. 255. The phrase *ašê šarri*, which seems to puzzle Dr. Clay, compared with *aši šamši*, 'sunrise,' denotes the coronation day of the king. It is used to date the expiry of a lease entered into on the second or third day of the new reign, and evidently expresses that the lease was till 'next coronation day.' The element Jâma, which occurs in such names as Gadali-Jâma, etc., is identified by Professor Clay with Jahwe, as giving the probable form Jâwa. It always occurs

in these texts at the end of the name, and is never written with the determinative of divinity before it. Hence Professor Hilprecht would identify it rather with the Hebrew מֶלֶךְ a longer form of מֶלֶךְ or מֶלֶךְ and adduces the name Abijam as denoting the same person as Abijah. The names ending in Jâme could be also regarded as compounds of Jahwe, but the same suspicion attaches to them as to those just noticed. The writing Jâme for Jâma is analogous to many things in both the contracts of the Hammurabi period and the letters of the Tell el-Amarna collections. There is, however, one name, Jâma-araĥ (Bu. 88-5-12, 314, l. 13, *Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets in the British Museum*, viii. p. 17), where Jâma is not final. A comparison with Abi-araĥ, Sumu-araĥ, etc., does suggest that here, at any rate, Jâma is a divine name. If so, Dr. Clay's view is greatly strengthened.

Enough has been said to show the great value of this work, and to encourage us to hope for many more contributions from the same quarter.

C. H. W. JOHNS.

Queens' College, Cambridge.

Books of the Month.

AN INTRODUCTION TO ECCLESIASTES. By A. H. M'Neile, B.D. (Cambridge: *At the University Press*. 7s. 6d. net).—The fascination of Koheleth is resistless. He fascinates the philosopher. 'Vapour of vapours, saith Koheleth; vapour of vapours, all is vapour'—that, in Mr. M'Neile's translation, is supposed to be his philosophy of life. He fascinates the scholar. Endless are the literary questions involved, and some of them are unresolvable. He fascinates the sinner and the saint, holding them both by a spell that is more than philosophical—'for to the man that is good before Him, He hath given wisdom and knowledge and gladness; but to the sinner He hath given the task of gathering and amassing to give to him that is good before God.'

The scholar must be first in his approach to Koheleth, and Mr. M'Neile comes as a scholar. He has to be philosopher and saint just a little, as he makes his excellent translation, but he is content to be a scholar throughout. He discusses the title, the canonicity, the circumstances, the integrity, the style, the relation to Ben-Sira and

the Book of Wisdom, and the Greek language. In two appendixes he discusses the Greek version and the Greek text. And all is a thorough scholar's thorough work. Mr. M'Neile verifies everything, states what he finds without reserve, and states it with perfect clearness. He will go beyond this, but not in conscientious scholarship, only in experience and a sense of what makes for edification.

Messrs. T. & T. Clark have published a sixth edition, revised and enlarged, and with 'Notes on Current Controversy,' of Mr. Frank Ballard's *Miracles of Unbelief*. And they have published it at a popular price (2s. 6d. net). No book has hit the rationalist so hard—the confident half-scholarly rationalist of our day. Its very title is a victory for Christ.

A practised hand is discerned in the choice of daily readings which goes by the name of *Leaves Worth Turning* (Allenson). The author's initials are J. E. The little book is one of the best of its numerous kind.

Messrs. S. C. Brown, Langham, & Company have published two volumes of sermons by the late Thomas Hancock. The one volume is called *The Pulpit and the Press* (6s.). The sermons it contains are all social—should we say socialistic? They were first preached and then published in the *Church Reformer*. In a prefatory note Mr. Stewart D. Headlam says that those who know Church history will place Thomas Hancock by the side of Frederick Maurice. Let us see.

One sermon is on Right. Its text is, 'Whatsoever is right, I will give you' (Mt 20⁴). Mr. Hancock says that there are two ideas of what is right. The one idea is, 'Didst thou not agree with me for a penny?—take that thine is and go thy way.' Mr. Hancock calls that idea of right Justice. The other idea is in the text. He calls it Charity. Charity? The workman says indignantly, 'We want justice, not charity.' The employer agrees, 'Go thy way, thou hast got thy penny.' But God does not agree. Whatsoever is right, that shalt thou receive, and He gives them not what they earn, but what they need.

The other volume is on the prodigal part of the Prodigal Son. Its title is *The Return to the Father* (2s. 6d.). Mr. J. W. Horsley introduces it.

He says: 'How versed he was in the Fathers, in the works of Orientalists, and in German theology, these sermons on the Prodigal Son show.' They are certainly not preachable sermons. But they make one think. They make one think and go back to read that parable again.

FAITH'S PERPLEXITIES. By the Rev. R. J. Drummond, D.D. (*Hodder & Stoughton*. 5s.).—This is the day of apologetic. Many people seem honestly anxious about the foundations of the faith. They fear that the Scriptures have lost their authority, they fear that even Christ Himself needs proving and defending. It is the great verities that are in question, not the fringes of the faith. And so Dr. Drummond, feeling the public pulse, writes a strong, broad book of popular apologetic, asking as if it had never been asked before, Can we trust the Gospels? Can we account for Jesus? Did miracles happen? Is prayer answered? and the like. His answers are good, popular, work-a-day answers. They give enough for any man to live by. They carry every man at least as far as Butler wanted, they say that the probabilities are with the Gospels and with Christ. Then let the man find Christ and be at peace.

THE HYMN-BOOK OF THE MODERN CHURCH. By Arthur E. Gregory, D.D. (*Kelly*. 3s. 6d.).—This is the thirty-fourth Fernley Lecture. Did Dr. Gregory or Mr. Kelly or whoever made the change from the familiar thin demy to this thick foolscap, did they consider how familiar the old form is to us, and how we love what is familiar? On a shelf we can point to the set; how will this range with them? There are more things in the shape of a book than are dreamt of in some publishers' philosophy. The book itself is good. It is charming. Its theme is of everlasting interest—for might not St. Paul have said that *four* things abide—faith, hope, love, and singing? And Dr. Gregory would have given the dullest subject life. He brightens all he touches. This book on Hymns seems nearly perfect for its purposes, but no one need be discouraged from producing another. The interest in the subject, if eternal, is also of endless variety.

The latest issue of the 'English Men of Letters' is a woman. And it is written by a woman—*Maria Edgeworth*, by the Hon. Emily Lawless.

(Macmillan; 2s. net). What does the Hon. Emily Lawless think of Maria Edgeworth? 'She was not—even a partial biographer must be frank—in the first flight of great writers, for although in *Castle Rackrent* she made a magnificent start, the promise which that book contained cannot be said to have been ever thoroughly fulfilled. She lost herself—*elle se perd dans votre triste utilité*, as Madame de Staël expressed it, in writing to their joint friend, M. Dumont—and she never thoroughly found herself again. What she might have been had her surroundings been different, it is idle now to speculate; and we must be content, therefore, to take her as she was. For my part I am absolutely content, seeing that I regard her as one of the very pleasantest personalities to be met with in the whole wide world of books.'

There is much in that word 'surroundings.' It is a synonym for Miss Edgeworth's worthy father, whom the Hon. Emily Lawless 'cannot abide.' Her aversion to Richard Lovell Edgeworth, Esquire, the good citizen and prosperous, the much married and adored husband, the exemplary father, is a passion with her, and does more than all she says about Maria Edgeworth to give piquancy to her book.

Messrs. Marshall Brothers have begun a series of very evangelical, partly anti-critical, scholarly little books called, 'Our Bible Hour.' The two volumes issued are *The Word of Life*, by David M. McIntyre, and *Hosea*, by C. H. Waller, D.D.

THE MAKING OF A SERMON. By Arthur T. Pierson (*Marshall Brothers*. 6s.).—Dr. Pierson's book is divided into two parts. The first part has to do with the making of a sermon; or at least, as the drunk man said in answer to the passing remark that he was going home—'whiles.' It occupies thirty pages. The rest of the book contains outlines of sermons. They occupy three hundred and fifty pages. Puzzle: Why did Dr. Pierson call his book 'The Making of a Sermon'?

Are outlines of sermons anything? Has anyone ever found a sermon in them? To the man who makes them the whole sermon can be read in the few abbreviated lines. To every one else they are so many undeciphered hieroglyphics. Outlines make for men just what all men can make for themselves. Give a sermon and any man will make an outline of it; give an outline and no man can make a sermon out of it. But sermons are

now so short, perhaps these are intended to be complete—three minutes on an average.

The part which is really concerned with the making of a sermon is thoroughly sound and useful. For a sermon it is too long, for the way to make a sermon it is far too short. Dr. Pierson lays down six rules, in sets of three: (1) search, meditate, compare; (2) pray, believe, obey. But the whole that he has to say can be expressed in a single rule: Make it a soul-saving sermon.

THE CREDENTIALS OF THE PENTATEUCH. By the late John Sealy Townsend (*Marshall Brothers*. 5s.).—This is a curious book for Messrs. Marshall to publish. We thought that since our friend George Macgregor died there were no critics left at Keswick, or in the Keswick publishing house. But this is pentateuchal criticism, unblushingly confessed on the very first page. From the third page take this: 'The beginning of Pentateuchal Criticism, in its modern features, is traced to Jean Astruc, a learned French physician (1753), and it should be kept in mind that modern criticism began with a *devout* man, who accepted Moses as the author of the Book of Genesis. That Book, being manifestly no independent creation by Moses, but a compilation of memorials of various kinds, Astruc gave himself to the work of finding the documents—if they were documents—which Moses had made use of. Astruc's discovery of the varied, but orderly, use of two names for God, "Elohim" and "Jehovah," has proved strikingly suggestive; and, though exaggerated conclusions may have been reached by failing to take into consideration the whole facts of the case, this discovery has given the impetus to, and suggested the directions of, modern criticism. So far as the Book of Genesis is concerned, every intelligent man knows that the Mosaic *authorship* means what we should now more discriminately call an *editorship*.'

This is the spirit of the book throughout, and its author is well informed, sometimes even curiously informed, so that it is well worth reading still, although the bulk of it was written in the Colenso period.

HELPS FOR SPEAKERS. By the Rev. H. O. Mackay (*Marshall Brothers*. 3s. 6d. net).—These are the helps which speakers most desire, not outlines of sermons, but pithy and pertinent illustrations. And this is a collection made by the

author from original sources. If they are not all new, they are new at least to books of illustration. Here is one of them: 'James Runciman, a journalist, who knew the varied vicissitudes of life by hard personal experience, wrote: "Of late so many things have been witnessed in public and private life that one is tempted to doubt whether *abstract morality* is of any use whatever in the world. One may tell a man that a certain course is dangerous, or even fatal; one may show by every device of logic and illustration that he should avoid the said course, and he will admit the truth of one's contention, yet he is not to be deterred from his folly, and he goes to ruin with a sort of blind abandonment. It is almost confounding to see how lucid of mind and how sane in theoretical judgment are the men who sometimes steep themselves in folly and even in vice.'"

A HISTORY OF THE GUNPOWDER PLOT.

By Philip Sidney (*R.T.S.* 5s.).—Mr. Sidney—Mr. Philip Sidney, he deserves his whole and honourable name—has written his history solely from the State papers. This is the history we stood in need of. For 'in no history of England, with perhaps the exception of that by Dr. S. R. Gardiner, or in no monograph dealing with the Plot, except the admirable volume of David Jardine, has the story of the conspiracy ever been told with anything like fidelity.' And so the Jesuits have been able to contradict and confute, till honest people had begun to wonder if ever there was a Gunpowder Plot at all.

There was a Gunpowder Plot. And it was a very immoral business. But the immorality was not all on the side of the Jesuits. What would have happened to this land if the Plot had come off, one shudders to think. But what did happen, though the plot did not come off, was much ugly hypocrisy and bloody spite. If it is true that the Jesuits would send us into the air to-day if they could get it done, then we had better keep ourselves in daily fear by dressing our soldiers in red. But it is a pity that we cannot keep up the alarm by a more creditable memory.

In any case let us know the truth. Mr. Philip Sidney has told it out. There is no false raising of the No-popery cry. The truth is terrible enough.

The Religious Tract Society has published a translation of Abbé Corneloup's *Story of My Con-*

version (1s. 6d.). Its restraint, its sincerity, its gradual clearness of conviction separate it from all the theatrical and hysterical stories of the kind.

THE DIVINE IDEA OF HUMAN DRESS. (*Elliot Stock.* 2s. net).—This is the modern *Sartor Resartus*. It lacks the freshness, it lacks the vehemence, it lacks the human cry. Still it recognizes the great place and mission which dress has in the things that pertain both to this life and the life which is to come.

Mr. Stockwell has published the following cheap books:—*Six Anti-Papal Studies*, by the Rev. J. Moffat Logan (1s. net); *The Light of the Gentiles*, by the Rev. R. Leitch, M.A. (2s. 6d. net); *Shot and Shell*, by the Rev. John Mitchell (1s. 6d. net); *Light in the Gloom*, by the Rev. George Hunsworth, M.A. (2s. 6d. net); *How William Knibb fought Slavery*, by F. C. Lusty (6d.); *The Creed of a Modern Christian*, by Herbert E. Binstead (2s. net).

Messrs. Swan Sonnenschein have published *A Vision of the Future*, by Miss Jane Hume Clapperton. It is a book of intense social interest, of bold modern remedy, and absolutely untouched by fear of consequence. The great purpose is to get rid of hereditary taint. Is there inherited disease, weakness, or even dulness? There need not be. There ought not to be. Stop the begetting of children by such persons; let Parliament stop it by law, and there will be only health, strength, cleverness—almost goodness. Yes, Miss Clapperton would go to law to do that; but in no other way would she curtail the liberty of the individual. In other respects she would grant the individual, even the young and irresponsible individual, liberty of action that sets ordinary rules of propriety at defiance. Whether that is right or wrong it is certainly risky beyond the utmost hope of adoption. But otherwise, why should not the great scientific ideas which Miss Clapperton expresses with irresistible clearness be allowed their operation? Then the vision would come to pass, and we should have at least a new earth.

Mr. Charles J. Thynne has published:—(1) *Birds without a Nest*, by Mrs. C. M. de Turner (1s. 6d. net); (2) *The Existence of Evil*, by the Rev. G. F. Whidborne, M.A. (1s. net); (3) *In the Net*, by the Rev. A. B. de Mille (6d. net).

Contributions and Comments.

Hebrew and Arabic in Roman Type.

Suggestions for a uniform system of transliteration from Hebrew and Arabic into Roman Print.

It will not be questioned that it would be a great convenience to be able to express Hebrew and Arabic words in ordinary type without danger of mistake; and it will also be allowed that this cannot at present be done. The reason seems to be that the attempt is always made on the phonetic principle, and this is from the first doomed to failure on two accounts: first, because Orientals and, still more, Oriental scholars are not agreed on the proper pronunciation, and also because we have not the necessary characters to express the peculiar sounds. The only satisfactory system is clearly that of transliteration; that is to say, we must be able to express each foreign consonant always by the same Roman letter, and no Roman letter must stand for two different foreign letters. It may seem hopeless to obtain general consent for a system of this kind; but the present writer submits that a sufficient basis of agreement may be found in the original identity of Western with Eastern alphabets. That this is a fact is probable by the constant tradition of the Greeks that they borrowed their alphabet from the Phœnicians, and it is rendered certain by comparing the names and the numerical value of the Hebrew letters with those of the earliest Greek alphabet. This will appear from the following table:—

Names and Numerical Value.		Roman Character.	
Hebrew Letters.	Greek Letters.		
Aleph 1	1 Alpha	A	
Beyth 2	2 Beta	B	
Gimel 3	3 Gamma	G	
Daleth 4	4 Delta	D	
Hey 5	5 E-(pilon)	E	
Vau 6	6 Bau (digamma)	F	
Zain 7	7 Zeta	Z	
Heth 8	8 Eta	H	
Teth 9	9 Theta		
Yowd 10	10 Iota	I, J	
Kaph 20	20 Kappa	K	
Lamed 30	30 Lambda	L	
Mem 40	40 Mu	M	

Names and Numerical Value.		Roman Character.	
Hebrew Letters.	Greek Letters.		
Nun 50	50 Nu	N	
Samek 60	60 (Sigma) xi	X	
'Ain 70	70 O-(mikron)	O	
Py 80	80 Pi	P	
Tsadi 90		Ts	
Qoph 100	90 Koppa	Q	
Resh 200	100 Rho	R	
Sin 300	200 San	S	
Tau 400	300 Tau	T	

A careful examination shows that reviving the Greek Theta, which the Latins dropped, we find in what we may call the Græco-Roman alphabet a regular descendant or representative of each of the Hebrew letters except Tsadi, whose sound is expressed by the combination Ts. The question now arises, What is the hindrance which has prevented Hebrew from being all along expressed as readily in the Roman as in the original characters? In the case of three letters the answer is plain, for A, E, O have always served among the Westerns as pure vowels, whereas the Orientals have treated them as consonants, as they still do to the present day.

For these three letters, then, we must find substitutes; and this is not a difficult task. For E universal custom obliges us to write h; and h, being thus appropriated to the weaker aspirate, we shall naturally take the German combination ch to express the stronger aspirate to which H really belongs. For A and O we may find natural substitutes by simply removing a stroke from the A and adding one to the O, the results being an inverted V and the figure 9. And if the compositor finds an inverted V not readily available, we may perhaps allow him to use instead the figure 6. The figures 6 and 9 thus adopted into our alphabet will suggest to the English reader no sound at all; but to the Hebraist will stand for two distinct letters, Alef and 'Ain, which it is important neither to omit nor to confound. As a substitute for the Greek Theta or the Hebrew Teth, we want a character which will suggest the T sound and yet be clearly distinguishable from the common t. These requirements will be both fulfilled in the script character by adding a second cross stroke to the t; and in type, by using a small

capital *ṭ*, the small letter being used in all other cases. To have thus found a suitable representative for each of the Hebrew consonants is probably enough for the scholar; but to enable the English reader to pronounce the words with a fair approach to accuracy, we must insert necessary vowels; and it will also be convenient to substitute for *F* and *J* the semi-vowels *w* and *y*—the vowel sound of *w* being (as in Welsh) that of the English double *o* in *tool*, or *u* in *rule*.

The following characters, then, will stand for the twenty-two letters of the Hebrew alphabet in their regular order: *ḡ, b, g, d, h, f* or *w, z, ch, ṭ, j* or *y, k, l, m, n, x, 9, p, ts, q, r, s, t*. Vowels—*a, e, i, o, u*.

As an example we give a rendering of the first few verses in Genesis: *Brḡsyṭ baraḡ ḡelohym ḡet hasmaym weḡet haḡarets: wehaḡarets hayetah tohw webohṭ wechosek ḡal pney tehowm, werwach ḡelohym merachepet ḡal pney hamaym: wayoḡmer ḡelohym yehy ḡowr wayhy ḡowr wayarḡ ḡelohym ḡet haḡowr ky towb.*

A few observations may be added on minor points:—

1. As to the letter corresponding to *X*, however the Hebrew *Samek* may have been originally pronounced, which is perhaps doubtful, it is certain that in historic times, as far back as the age of the Greek *LXX*, it was always sounded like a soft *C*, and therefore may be suitably represented by a *C* with *cedilla*, if the compositor has this mark at his command.

2. To avoid the risk of the combination *ts* being mistaken for two separate letters, we may link them together by a line underneath; or, better still, we may employ a diminutive *s*. Similarly, in the combination *ch* we may place a diminutive *c* before the upper part of the *h*.

3. The Hebrew *dagesh forte*, denoting the doubling of a letter, may be expressed by the figure 2 placed above it. *Dagesh lene*, having no grammatical or exegetical significance, may be safely neglected. For the phonetic effect of its use (or rather disuse) the English reader need only bear in mind that *after a vowel* *p* and *t* are sounded like *ph* and *th*; thus *ap*, *ḡet* are pronounced *aph*, *eth*.

4. In the Arabic alphabet, out of the twenty-eight letters twenty-two are seen by their names and numerical value to be identical with the Hebrew

letters, and may therefore be represented in Roman type in the same way. The remaining six letters differ from the originals merely by the addition of a diacritical dot, which of course may be added in the same way to the corresponding Roman characters. *This diacritical dot also serves to distinguish the Hebrew Shin from Sin.*

My conclusions may be briefly summed up as follows:—

Of the twenty-two Hebrew letters the representatives of fourteen may be reckoned as fairly unquestionable from their sound or position in the alphabet. These are: *b, g, d, z, k, l, m, n, p, ts, q, r, s, t*. The remaining eight Hebrew letters may be conveniently classed in pairs—

A pair of aspirates, the weak aspirate represented by *h* and the stronger by the German *ch*;

A pair of semi-vowels, represented by the English semi-vowels *w* and *y*;

A pair of gutturals, having no corresponding sound in English, represented by the figures *ḡ* and *9*, both modifications of the letter *o* or the figure *o*;

A pair of secondaries, the secondary *t* sound represented by the small capital *ṭ*, and the secondary *s* sound represented by the soft *ç*, or, more strictly, by *x*, the correspondent in position in the Greek alphabet to the Hebrew *samek*, standing as it does next to *n*.

It will be noticed that in the whole above scheme there is only one purely arbitrary assumption, that of taking the figure *ḡ* to represent the letter *Aleph*. The writer therefore flatters himself that he has succeeded in pointing out a principle on which it is possible to frame an intelligent system of exact transliteration.

J. B. ANSTED.

Christ College, Cambridge.

The First English Example of 'Biblia.'

In connexion with the centenary of the British and Foreign Bible Society, I came upon the strange fact that nobody as yet knows how the word *Bible* found its way into the European languages. In the *Dictionary of the Bible*, i. 286, we read: 'this expression (τα βιβλία, "the books" *par excellence*) is said to appear for the first time in this connexion in the 2nd Epistle (14²), falsely attributed to Clement of Rome, and written prob-

ably towards the end of the second century.' But the passage is corrupt, as is best shown by Th. Zahn in a special *excursus* on this passage in his *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*, ii. 942-945. We must read 'τὰ βιβλία τῶν προφητῶν, the books of the prophets.'

Equally wrong is the other statement frequently met with, that βιβλία in the special sense 'the Bible' was first used by Chrysostom. This, too, is shown by Zahn in the same connexion: he declares not to dare to say anything about the first appearance of the word Bible in the occidental languages.

The name commonly used for the Bible throughout the Middle Ages was '*Bibliotheca*.' The *D.B.* justly states: 'It appears with this meaning in old English, and was technically employed by mediæval writers to designate a complete MS. of O.T. and N.T.'

The great *Oxford Dictionary* (s.v. 'Bible,' vol. i., 1888) quotes from Becker's *Catalogi Bibliothecarum antiqui*, p. 42, one example for '*Biblia*' from the ninth century; then as the next, from the Catalogue of Lindisfarne, 1095 (Becker, p. 172): 'Unam *bibliam* in duobus voluminibus . . . *Bibliotheca*, i.e. vetus et novum testamentum in duobus libris.'

Its next example is from the Catalogue of the Church of Durham of the year 1266 (Becker, p. 256): 'Unam *bibliam* in iv. magnis voluminibus . . . aliam *bibliam* in duobus voluminibus.'

But the first example is wrongly dated: the year 1095 is the time of Bishop William de St. Carileph, who left to Durham a *bibliotheca*, i.e. bible, 'in two volumes.' The introductory remark in the charter roll still preserved in the Cathedral treasury ('habet etiam ecclesia ex dono dicto Wilhelmi episcopi primi unum [!] *bibliam* in duobus voluminibus et plures alios libros, uts cribitur in principio secundae partis *bibliae* eiusdem sub hac forma,' etc.) dates from the fourteenth, or more probably the fifteenth century. Therefore, not 1095 but 1266 must be quoted for the first appearance of the word *Biblia* in English catalogues. About the same time, it is stated about Stephan Langton, 1228: 'Hic super totam *Bibliam* postillas fecit et eam per capitula quibus nunc utuntur moderni, distinaeit.'

Becker's example from the ninth century is from the catalogue of an unknown French library, which begins: (1) *biblia Vulfadi*; (2) *historia Josephi*, etc.

The next examples in Becker's *Catalogi* are from

Monte Cassino (12th cent., No. 119) and *Stederburg* in Brunswic (12th cent., No. 124, *liber genesis*; *bibliae*): All other catalogues have *bibliotheca* or *pandectes*.

This correction about the Lindisfarne Catalogue is due to the kindness of H. Glee, D.D., Master of University College, Durham.¹ EB. NESTLE.

Maulbronn.

The Writings of Professor A. B. Davidson.

THE Rev. James Strachan has, in the July number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES passed such strictures on my method of editing the writings of the late Professor Davidson, that I ask leave to answer the main charges he brings against me. Although Mr. Strachan is quite right in saying that there are 'well-known principles of historical criticism,' I shall show that he is most unsuccessful in his application of them. He blames me for not giving the approximate dates of the various lectures in *Old Testament Prophecy*, declaring that Dr. Davidson wrote the earliest nearly forty years before he wrote the latest; and that, as his views were gradually changing all the time, my procedure is 'not only bewildering to the reader but unfair to the author.' Mr. Strachan, however, does not state which are the lectures *his* critical instinct has enabled him to select as the earliest and which as the latest. An anonymous critic in the *Aberdeen Free Press*, who made the same charge against me, was not equally cautious. He selected two lectures for special praise as being the product of Dr. Davidson's 'mature wisdom.' These two are, I am certain, the very earliest of all.

The most definite statement Mr. Strachan makes is that 'a considerable number fell into desuetude.' Of course I do not know what Mr. Strachan would call 'a considerable number'; but this I know, that out of the twenty-four chapters of *Old Testament Prophecy*, no fewer than *twenty* were delivered, more or less fully, by Dr. Davidson during the last complete session he was spared to lecture (1900-01); and among the remaining four are the very two which the anonymous Aberdeen

¹ We regret that by an oversight Dr. Nestle's article '*Anise*' and '*Rue*' (p. 528) was not proof-read. Correct '*anise* or cummin' into '*anise* and cummin,' '*Aramaicische*' into '*Aramaische*,' '*graveoleus*' into '*graveolens*.'

critic gave me credit for publishing as containing Dr. Davidson's *mature* views; and another of the four this same critic singled out for high commendation. Will Mr. Strachan kindly name the fourth, and prove that it fell into desuetude? If he does, I shall then explain why I published it.

Surely the point of supreme importance in determining a deceased author's relation to any lecture is not when it was *first* written but when it was *last* delivered.

Mr. Strachan also pillories me for *not reproducing the dates even of the articles* which, he affirms, were reprinted from the *Expositor*. Had he read with any care my brief Preface, he might, one would think, have easily inferred why I did not 'reproduce' these dates. In that Preface I state as clearly as my command of the English language enabled me to do, that 'every chapter in this book has been taken direct from the manuscript lectures which were used by the author in his classes up to the last.' The chapters therefore to which Mr. Strachan alludes were not reprinted from the *Expositor* at all. Consequently to have appended the *Expositor* dates would have been 'bewildering to the reader and unfair to the author.'

To this extreme carelessness in reading my Preface, I attribute another astounding critical blunder of Mr. Strachan's. He accuses me of 'deleting' a sentence from Dr. Davidson's first article on 'The various kinds of Messianic Prophecy,' and winds up his castigation of me with the emphatic declaration: 'The point is that Dr. Davidson would have deleted any sentence rather than this particular one.' Now no editor can *delete* a sentence that does not occur in the MS. he is editing; and if I had inserted this sentence from the *Expositor*, as Mr. Strachan actually maintains I should have done, and had made it the opening one of the nineteenth chapter of *Old Testament Prophecy*: '*In the following papers* I mean to make some observations on a *single point* in connexion with Messianic prophecy; how readers would have stared, and critics like Mr. Strachan would have rejoiced! Can he not see, now, that the simple explanation of this sentence being found in the *Expositor* is that when Dr. Davidson resolved to publish these articles separately, he wrote it just as a prefatory sentence to them, but that it could not possibly have occurred in an ordinary class lecture? Doubtless Mr. Strachan's common sense would have kept him from falling into such a ridiculous mistake, had he not 'for some inscrutable reason' been over-anxious to score one more point against me.

Mr. Strachan asserts that the *Old Testament Prophecy* I have edited is 'not the Old Testament Prophecy to which Dr. Davidson's students listened.' In one sense, as my own Preface shows, I might admit this, for I stated that 'these lectures represent only a very small part of the work done in the Hebrew classroom to elucidate the teaching of the Old Testament prophets.' But when Mr. Strachan adds, 'The difference is not merely the absence of the living voice and the unique personality . . . the book has been depleted and impoverished by injudicious editing,' I give the statement about *depletion* an emphatic denial. Every lecture I have published is given in a fuller form than it was ever delivered to any one class. Probably had Mr. Strachan known that I had been myself a student under Dr. Davidson, he would have employed somewhat more measured terms. Even though I leave out of account altogether my intimate friendship with Dr. Davidson since 1876, when I came to Edinburgh as a professor, I have as much right as Mr. Strachan to speak as a student of the deceased professor. No doubt, the printed book has not impressed Mr. Strachan as the delivered lectures did; but the difference lies not in the words printed but in the person reading them. Just think of the difference between the young enthusiastic student, who could go bounding up the long stone stairs of New College to hear his revered professor lecture, and the staid, middle-aged, disillusioned minister reading the same lectures alone in a London study! Is it any wonder that they seem to him different now?

To a certain extent, indeed, I plead guilty to having voluntarily depleted the volume on *Old Testament Prophecy*. Principal Salmond being general editor of 'The International Theological Library,' and thus responsible, so far, for the final form of every volume in that series, I thought it best that he should have the whole responsibility of editing the *Old Testament Theology*. I expected that work to be published before and not after *Old Testament Prophecy*, as, indeed, I stated in my Preface to *Biblical and Literary Essays*. I sent Dr. Salmond the manuscripts within a few months of Dr. Davidson's death, and forwarded much material which I might quite naturally have retained for the *Prophecy* volume, e.g. the two last chapters on 'Eschatology,' for it was my desire that the *Old Testament Theology*, having been so long promised by Dr. Davidson himself, should be as full and complete as possible. Mr. Strachan may think I was wrong in doing this. I still feel that I was right; and I have the satisfaction of knowing that, though Mr. Strachan has no confidence in my judgment, Dr. Davidson himself had.

Mr. Strachan's statement that I have 'torn the

lectures on Psalms 2, 72, and 110 from their organic connexion' by publishing them in the *Biblical and Literary Essays*, and that 'Dr. Davidson *always* read these three lectures along with those on Messianic prophecy' is not in accordance with fact. Dr. Davidson no doubt did so frequently; but he did not do so invariably; and any unbiassed person who reads these essays will acknowledge that they are of an essentially different type from the lectures in *Old Testament Prophecy*, and would, in the form in which they are published, have been out of place in that volume.

In like manner Mr. Strachan condemns me for what he calls 'the still more serious misplacement of the admirable lectures on Amos, Hosea, and Joel.' Yet, in acting as I have done in *reprinting* the first two in the *Biblical Essays*, I am persuaded that I have carried out Dr. Davidson's own wishes. Whenever he continued to deliver to his students lectures he had already published, he was in the habit of preserving the manuscripts and then correcting and amplifying them. But he did not preserve the MSS of the articles on Amos and Hosea. Consequently, these could only have been reprints; and in *Old Testament Prophecy*, as I have said, there are no mere reprints.

But I think the most audacious thing in this paper of Mr. Strachan's is that he should actually write: 'We are expressly told by the editor that *his* idea is to present Dr. Davidson's views of "prophecy in general."' He puts this phrase 'prophecy in general' in inverted commas twice, and even calls it 'an innocent phrase which betrays a very complete misunderstanding of all Dr. Davidson's habits of mind.' I fancy your readers will scarcely credit the statement that I never once used this phrase. It is Mr. Strachan's own; and whether innocent or not, he should not father it on me. I ask any one who desires fully to understand the audacity of this style of criticism to read the last paragraph on p. 6 of my Preface, by every word of which I still stand.

Mr. Strachan's remarks about the *Biblical and Literary Essays* are of the same stamp, and could not have been made by any fair-minded critic who had read, with understanding, my Preface to that book. He says that some of these might have been dated, and gives as an instance 'Mohammed and Islam,' which he kindly tells us was delivered to the New College Missionary Society on 8th March 1884. No doubt it was; but as a matter of fact I heard it delivered to an entirely different audience and at an entirely different date. Had I named that other Society and fixed on that other date, would it have increased the value of the lecture one whit? or would Mr. Strachan have corrected my facts and substituted his own? What interests the reading public in lectures that

may have been delivered ten or twenty times is not *when* or *where* they were delivered, but the truths they contain.

Finally, as to my editing of Dr. Davidson's sermons, Mr. Strachan asserts that 'the publication of the sermons on "Elijah," "The Call of Isaiah," etc. etc., without a note as to their real nature, as if they were *sermons*, creates quite a wrong impression and of course still further impoverishes the *Old Testament Prophecy*. These were ordinary class lectures.' As published, I say that these are sermons; and I am certain that Mr. Strachan never heard them delivered *verbatim* as class lectures. That he heard considerable portions of them so delivered I am well aware. I searched some weary weeks among Dr. Davidson's class lectures for 'Saul' and 'Elijah' and never could find them. Only when I was going over the sermons, one by one, did I discover these long-sought treasures. I am absolutely sure, therefore, that they were written as sermons, and were preached as such. The Psalms and Paraphrases sung along with them, and the portions of Scripture read, were all marked down on the first page, as in the case of sermons like 'It is finished' or 'The power of His resurrection.'

It is, of course, just possible that, had Dr. Davidson been spared to publish *Old Testament Prophecy* himself, he might have cut and carved a good few of the sermons into lectures suitable for publication in such a volume; but had I as editor acted in this way, I should have been guilty of a disgraceful 'breach of trust.' As left by him in manuscript, all the sermons I have published were sermons and not class lectures; and if a hundred of the reading public were to read the particular sermons which Mr. Strachan maintains are 'not sermons but ordinary class lectures,' I am sure at least ninety-nine would laugh his assertion to scorn. No doubt Dr. Davidson was 'first and foremost a professor.' But even a professor may write sermons. Mr. Strachan is the first and only critic who has found fault with me on this score, and I fancy he will be the last.

At all events, whatever Mr. Strachan and individuals like him may think or write regarding the way in which I have performed those editorial duties with which Dr. Davidson judged it wise to intrust me, the verdict of the great reading public has been already pronounced, and that in a way absolutely satisfactory both to the editor and to the publishers.

J. A. PATERSON.

New College, Edinburgh.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, St. Cyrus, Montrose.

